

TESTIMONY . . . Louis F. Budenz

9335
4a60

No 9335.1a60



GIVEN BY

U. S. SUPT. OF DOCUMENTS

INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

LOUIS F. BUDENZ

*U.S. Congress. House. Committee on
un-American activities.*

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

H. Res. 5

TO INVESTIGATE (1) THE EXTENT, CHARACTER, AND OBJECTS
OF UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED
STATES; (2) THE DIFFUSION WITHIN THE UNITED STATES
OF SUBVERSIVE AND UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA THAT IS
INSTIGATED FROM FOREIGN COUNTRIES OR OF A DOMESTIC
ORIGIN AND ATTACKS THE PRINCIPLE OF THE FORM OF
GOVERNMENT AS GUARANTEED BY OUR CONSTITUTION; AND
(3) ALL OTHER QUESTIONS IN RELATION THERETO THAT
WOULD AID CONGRESS IN ANY NECESSARY REMEDIAL
LEGISLATION

NOVEMBER 22, 1946
AT WASHINGTON, D. C.

Printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1946

**9335.4A'0*

House of Representatives

March 1940

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

JOHN S. WOOD, Georgia, *Chairman*

JOHN E. RANKIN, Mississippi

J. HARDIN PETERSON, Florida

J. W. ROBINSON, Utah

JOHN R. MURDOCK, Arizona

HERBERT C. BONNER, North Carolina

J. PARRELL THOMAS, New Jersey

KARL E. MUNDT, South Dakota

GERALD W. LANDIS, Indiana

ERNIE ADAMSON, *Counsel*

JOHN W. CARRINGTON, *Clerk*

INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 22, 1946

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C.

The committee met at 10 a. m., Hon. John S. Wood (chairman), presiding.

THE CHAIRMAN. Let the committee be in order. Do you have some evidence to present, Mr. Adamson?

MR. ADAMSON. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I want to call the witness Louis Budenz, a professor at Fordham University. Mr. Budenz is here under subpoena.

THE CHAIRMAN. The witness will be sworn.

(Whereupon the witness was sworn by the chairman.)

MR. ADAMSON. Now, Professor Budenz, will you give your name and address to the reporter.

TESTIMONY OF LOUIS FRANCIS BUDENZ

MR. BUDENZ. Louis Francis Budenz, 26 Manhattan Avenue, Crestwood, Yonkers, N. Y.

MR. ADAMSON. What business or profession are you in?

MR. BUDENZ. At present I am assistant professor of economics at Fordham University.

MR. ADAMSON. Prior to your affiliation with Fordham University, what did you do?

MR. BUDENZ. I was assistant professor of economics at Notre Dame University.

MR. ADAMSON. Prior to your work at Notre Dame, what did you do?

MR. BUDENZ. I was managing editor of the Daily Worker and president of the Freedom of the Press Company, Inc., the corporation that controlled and managed the Daily Worker.

MR. RANKIN. When you say the Daily Worker, do you mean the Communist Daily Worker?

MR. BUDENZ. I mean the official organ of the Communist Party in the United States.

MR. RANKIN. And that is published in New York City?

MR. BUDENZ. That is correct.

MR. ADAMSON. How long were you affiliated with the Daily Worker?

MR. BUDENZ. Well, I was a member of the Communist Party for 10 years; 6 years a member of the national committee, and originally I was labor editor of the Daily Worker for approximately 3 years.

Then I was editor of the Midwest Daily Record of Chicago, likewise initiated by the Communists, for approximately 3 years, and from 1940 on I was president of the Freedom of the Press Corp.

Shortly thereafter I was made also the managing editor of the Daily Worker.

Mr. ADAMSON. Now, Professor Budenz, I understand that you have prepared some testimony which you are willing to give to this committee concerning the activities of certain officials and members of the Communist Party and their organization, not only in the United States but also in other parts of the world. Are you prepared to proceed with your statement?

Mr. BUDENZ. I am prepared.

Mr. ADAMSON. Will you please go ahead in your own words?

Mr. BUDENZ. As I understand it, specifically, this appearance before the committee under subpoena was a result of a speech that I made from Detroit over the radio on October 13. In that speech I asserted—and I will file with the committee a recording of my speech over the radio later so that the exact wording can be brought before you—that the Communist International exists in fact, if not in form; that is to say, I asserted that international communications with Moscow continue to exist and what are approximately instructions from Moscow continue to be given to the Communist parties throughout the world.

I further said that a specific individual here was the equivalent of a representative of the Communist International. I used that specific phraseology because it was the phraseology given to me officially by the representative of the political committee of the Communist Party of the United States. This incident I shall refer to later on. I therefore wish to repeat this specific phraseology; namely, that a certain individual operating in this country was the equivalent of the representative of the Communist International in the United States.

Mr. RANKIN. Will you insert your radio speech in the record at this point?

Mr. BUDENZ. I will insert the recording of the speech. I do not have it with me because I was afraid of breaking it, but I will send it to the committee and file it.

This opens up, of course, a wider vista than just this particular matter of this particular individual. I referred to certain articles written by this man, and as a result of that Frederick Woltman, of the New York World-Telegram independently discovered that this man was Hans Berger, otherwise known as Gerhart Eisler—which is his correct name. Gerhart Eisler—Woltman independently published this fact. I, therefore, confirmed this fact at that time, although I had originally said that I would make the statement first to a responsible agency of the United States Government, that is, the statement as to who the man in question was, the specific name of the individual.

I would like to say, before going further, that in this present testimony I have no animus against any particular member of the Communist Party. There is no personality involved; however, I do think it is time, from my experience, to raise the little iron curtain in the United States.

What is the little iron curtain? It is the refusal in many quarters to permit a frank discussion of what the Communist Party actually is.

Anyone who endeavors to tell the truth about the Communist Party is greeted with shouts of "witch hunt," "red baiter," and things of that character.

I claim that the honest, normal American citizen has a right to know the facts without this effort to put down a curtain upon the activities of the Communist Party.

With that understanding I will proceed with a statement concerning this radio speech. In the first place, I must give the background of the Communist Party and its operations—which led to the speech being made.

Mr. RANKIN. I might say to you, the little iron curtain has been raised here, and you may proceed with your statement.

Mr. BUDENZ. That is very good to know.

Of course, this little iron curtain is carried forward by certain individuals, many of whom know not what they do. They are imposed upon the Communists and are sarcastically known by the Communists as "the soft-headed and soft-hearted liberals." They are used because of their naivete, to do many things that the Communists cannot do themselves.

We must understand, then, before we get to the meat of the matter that we are dealing with a conspiracy to establish Soviet dictatorship throughout the world. This conspiracy resorts normally to illegal methods. This conspiracy requires the utmost servility on the part of the so-called Communist leaders in various countries throughout the world. It makes puppets of this leadership, as shown in the case of William Z. Foster or Earl Browder.

At the present moment this conspiracy is directed specifically against the peace and safety of the United States of America. Those are serious charges, but they can be fully confirmed. You must also know the background of this business in order to appreciate this one instance before us. That is, the reference to Berger-Eisler is only an incident, but the point of the matter is that it is an incident which illustrates what the American people should know much more about.

I say this conspiracy is to establish the Soviet dictatorship throughout the world. There is so much evidence on that I even hesitate to try to add further confirmation. But we have such confirmation in the activities of the Communist Party itself in the United States. Never throughout its history has the Communist Party found one defect of any kind in any leader of the Soviet Union who was endorsed by the Kremlin. You can search the Daily Worker or any other Communist publication from beginning to end for 25 years and you will find that always the Soviet leadership is 100 percent perfect in those pages—they have godlike qualities that prevent any flaw being found in them. Secondly, this movement follows Moscow in every detail. Examination of the official Communist press will confirm this, that the policies desired by the Kremlin are followed out servilely by this organization and its leadership. That stamps it immediately as something set off from the rest of America, as a quisling organization as much under the heel of the Kremlin, or at the behest of the Kremlin, as the Nazi bund was the agent of Hitler's Germany.

Of course, no one can appreciate fully or vividly what destruction of intellectual integrity is involved in this matter unless he has been an official Communist and gone through the process. America is

totally ignorant of what takes place back of the little iron curtain. I will give you one or two examples of this matter to confirm further what I have to say.

Now, in regard to the matter of the Soviet dictatorship, we have the statements by gentlemen of outstanding importance, such as Mr. Molotov, as to the intentions of the Communist International movement and the Soviet Government. There has been no bashfulness on this question. Mr. Molotov in 1928, in a statement that I have publicly quoted before, declared over and over again in a speech to the Leningrad functionaries of the Communist Party that the sole aim of the Communist International is the establishment of "world proletarian dictatorship." And he did not only say that once; he repeated it over and over again in that speech, so that it would be driven home.

In 1935, at the seventh congress of the Communist International—and this was the congress which was supposed to bring democratic organizations and nations in alignment with the Soviet Union, or the Soviet Union in alignment with them—the promise of Soviet dictatorship throughout the world was continued. As a matter of fact, Wilhelm Piek, the chairman of the seventh congress, stated specifically that their objective was Soviet power, everywhere, their banner was the banner of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, and that their leader everywhere was Stalin. In order to make this still more emphatic a special resolution of personal fealty to Stalin was adopted at the seventh congress of the Communist International in which the Communist leadership there from all over the world, including the Communist leadership of the United States, pledged itself to unending, unbending devotion—and those are not the exact words, but I shall file a copy of that resolution with the committee; the words here give the idea—unending, unbending devotion to Stalin as their leader and teacher. And this was enthusiastically endorsed by the leadership of the Communist Party from the United States who were present, including, and specifically including, Earl Browder.

I have said that this conspiracy engaged and engages in illegal activities. We have the case of Mr. Browder's false passport, and that is more or less a typical condition among Communist leaders—"Krumbein technical difficulties" they are called.

The treasurer of the Communist Party, Mr. Krumbein, at least he was recently the treasurer, and, by the way, he is personally a nice enough gentleman—spent 18 months in prison because of a false passport. In fact, when I entered the party I had to delay my acquaintance with him because he was in jail at that time under the false passport charge. We can find that Mr. Ben Gitlow, referring to the time when he was general secretary of the party, in his book I Confess reproduced a copy of a false passport under which he traveled. When the Hitler-Stalin pact came around there were so many of the leading comrades who had "technical difficulties" that practically everybody was going underground at that time. They put on mustaches; they went down to Florida as "tired businessmen," and they disappeared. In fact, some of them disappeared for almost 2 years. As a matter of fact, what brought this specifically to my attention was the fact that they wanted me to disappear: they wanted me to go to a hotel and register under an assumed name and remain away from home. I refused to do this because, as I said, "What is the matter

with me? As an American, I can stand out in the light of day." So it was agreed that I did have this exemption, and it was found very surprising that anyone in a leading position would not have some "technical difficulty."

Mr. RANKIN. Repeat the name of that man who spent some time in prison.

Mr. BUDENZ. Charles Krumbein. He spent 18 months in prison.

Mr. RANKIN. Where is he now?

Mr. BUDENZ. Well, he was national treasurer of the Communist Party, and that was when I left the organization. I have no animosity toward Mr. Krumbein, but I mention that as a fact to prove the illegal activities of the party.

Mr. RANKIN. Do you know where he is now?

Mr. BUDENZ. I do not know specifically at the moment.

I mentioned Mr. Gitlow, though, likewise, to show that this illegal work is a tradition in the party. That does not mean that everyone is engaged in it, but there is enough of it to make it a system and tradition.

Further than that, this conspiracy's illegal work is now directed against the United States, and we have had enough evidence on that surely that somebody ought to realize this.

We will take, for example, the Jacques Duclos article written in 1945, which deposed Browder from leadership.

Mr. RANKIN. Before you go on further, you made a statement just a few moments ago that "this is directed against the United States." Do you mean directed toward the overthrow of the Government?

Mr. BUDENZ. I mean that the Soviet Government has now revealed through my experience in discussions within the Communist Party the fact that it is engaged in a war of nerves against the United States on a general pattern similar to that carried on by Hitler's Germany, but with its own variations, and that this war of nerves will go to the point of military conflict. That is, according to the design of the Soviet Government, it can go to the point of military conflict. At any rate, it is a war of nerves designed to undermine the Government of the United States.

Mr. MUNDY. You do not think there is any danger of its going to military conflict as long as we have the atom bomb and they do not have the atom bomb?

Mr. BUDENZ. That is another question. I am only disclosing what I learned and not my opinion in the matter. However, I would like to go further and state that a responsible person will not say what I am saying without grave reasons. These reasons come about from the experience that I had over a number of years.

We will take, for example, the Duclos article of April 1945 which deposed Mr. Browder. That article states very definitely that the Tehran Pact is "only a diplomatic gesture." What is the Tehran Pact? It was the agreement between Stalin, Churchill, and Roosevelt that there would be generations of peace. The Soviet Union, through Mr. Duclos, takes the initiative in stating that this pact is only a diplomatic gesture. It was certainly understood by every trained Communist leader that if the Tehran Pact was to be torn up as a diplomatic gesture, it would mean that the era of peace seeking was over regardless of what form the new era may take.

Secondly, Earl Browder was deposed as a "revisionist" for standing on the platform of Teheran and assuming that the pact was something that was going to last for quite a period of years. For that he was declared a revisionist, which incidentally constitutes as great a crime on the right in Communist eyes as being a Trotskyite is on the left. If you are a revisionist, you are "an enemy of the Soviet Union, the working class, and the Communist Party" according to Communist ideas. And Mr. Browder, who had been one of the most servile agents of Moscow, its wills, whims, and wishes, was surprisingly and suddenly confronted with that accusation.

Of course, we can see immediately that when Mr. Browder was confronted with the accusation that fact gave notice to every Communist leader throughout the world that the relations with the United States had changed. If he were deposed, as a revisionist for holding onto the Tehran Pact, why, necessarily, the whole idea that the Tehran Pact was a valid pact was to be disposed of. In addition, certainly the sharp disciplining of Browder showed that a future upholding of the Tehran Pact, and the idea back of it of peace with the United States, was fully incorrect. It was even hostile to the views of the Soviet Union.

I will try to return later to confirm further evidence that I could give in regard to discussions on this matter within the Communist Party. Though I do not wish to take too much time with this initial background, that background is very important.

Now, that brings me to the fourth step, the acts around Browder's expulsion that showed the Quisling nature of the Communist Party. I wish to try to reserve the possibility of referring later, however, to certain discussions around the Duvelos article. I want to show, how subservient the leadership, so-called, of the Communist Party is to the will, whim, and wish of Moscow.

Prior to the Duvelos article, Earl Browder was applauded for half an hour every time he appeared, even in a secret national committee meeting. Not only that, he was hailed as the greatest Marxist-Leninist in the Western Hemisphere. Not only that, every member of the national committee would declare at every meeting that he agreed fully with the report that Browder would make. Browder would speak from 2 to 4 hours in the national committee at each of its sessions, and then everyone present would state that they were in agreement with his proposals 100 percent.

It was disclosed later, as Browder was being deposed, that these agreements with his policy had been written before the national committee members even knew what he was going to say. The national committee members of the American Party thus actually wrote their commendations of Browder's reports before they knew what the report was going to include. And this was confessed by men and women, one after another, in the secret national committee meeting in June 1945. I have never seen such a confession of intellectual degradation as was shown by this exhibition in the national committee meeting. Some of the confessions have been printed. They have been watered down but printed. One of them is the confession of Elizabeth Flynn. I cannot give you the exact wording, but you can consult the article of September 1945 in Political Affairs, which is the official theoretical organ of the Communist Party: for-

merly known as the Communist. In this issue Elizabeth Flynn says that although she is a member of the political committee—the so-called powerful six who are supposed to run the party—she has not had any independent thought or action throughout that period. And the reason she says that this was the case is that she was told that she "did not know theory."

Now, you can see how convenient in intimidating people it is to say they have a lack of knowledge of theory. When two or three select Communist leaders have a thought that they want to put over to their comrades, but which they cannot explain fully because it is not their thought, having been handed to them, they can charge you cannot understand them because you do not know Marxist-Leninist theory. Elizabeth Flynn, a leader of the Communist Party, could not have one individual thought or act because she was accused of not knowing theory. She was paralyzed intellectually. This is confessed by her in print, though watered down from her previous speech.

Then there is the case of William Z. Foster, the national chairman of the party. He declared, and this is partly in print likewise, that he did not dare raise objections that he had to Browder's policy because he was afraid of being expelled from the party. Imagine one of the leaders of the party, the national chairman, not daring to express an opinion because he is afraid of expulsion. That shows the servility with which these things are carried out.

If you will look at the history of the Communist Parties, you will find that there is always a left and right leader as a rule kept on ice in every party. Then one can be pulled out on this occasion and another can be pulled out on another time, like marionettes when policy changes or the line changes. Foster had a left reputation and was always trying to jump the line ahead of time. He always thought that he saw another change was going to be made and he was always trying to be ahead of time.

In 1944, as a consequence, he wrote a letter to the national committee criticizing Browder's policies. This letter was voted down by the national committee after a very hurried session, but in addition it was suppressed. This is testified to by Foster himself. It is testified to in print in this same article. Not only was his letter suppressed, in addition, no national committee member was allowed to keep the letter, and not one of the rank and file of the Communist Party knew that it existed, knew that their national chairman was in disagreement with their general secretary.

Gentlemen, I only got to look at that letter in a fragmentary way as managing editor of the Daily Worker, and I was not even allowed to hold it in my hands by the member of the political committee who showed it to me. I got a glance at it, but I did not know its real contents because it had to be very hurriedly looked at. No national committee member in this country was allowed to keep it or study it. But, lo and behold, this letter appears later in the hands of Jacques Duclos, hundreds of miles away in France. The letter not only appears there, but he studies it, and he quotes from it, and he commends part of it, a letter which the American national committeemen were not even allowed to study. A gentleman across the seas was allowed not only to study it but to quote, comment, and commend that letter.

Mr. MUNDT. Who suppressed it? You were not allowed to hold it?

Mr. BUDENZ. The national committee suppressed it, and Earl Browder suppressed it. I will come to that later.

As a matter of fact, I might say here that conspicuous in helping the suppression was Mr. Eisler as Hans Berger.

Agreement with Tehran was then the line. Foster was jumping the line, although this letter was very conveniently used later on to demolish Browder in the way that they wanted to demolish him for the time being.

Not only that, I will call your attention, gentlemen, to Mr. Browder's statement on this Duclos article, and this is very significant. In introducing this article to the readers of the Daily Worker, and I noted this particularly at the time as managing editor, Mr. Browder said:

This undoubtedly represents the opinion of all the leading European Marxists. Just appreciate the significance of that observation. By some stroke of genius Earl Browder knows so quickly that all the leading European Marxists think him to be a criminal "against the Soviet Union, the Communist Party and the working class." Those phrases go together in the definition of "a revisionist." He knows that he has been condemned by all Marxist leaders in Europe. And I ask you, How could he know that without close organizational international communication? How could he know in double-quick time what all the leading European Marxists thought? And yet in print Mr. Browder says:

This undoubtedly represents the opinion of all the European Marxists. This Duclos article which condemns him, mind you, as a revisionist.

I want to ask you further, who is the "leading European Marxist"? We know from the resolution of 1935 that it is "the teacher and leader" Josef Stalin, and by his little phrase Mr. Browder was able to acquaint every trained Communist everywhere—certainly he acquainted me and I think everyone else—with the fact that this Duclos view was approved by Moscow; this was the voice of authority. And I want to tell you that the national committee recognized it and knew it as the voice of authority. Here was Browder, who had been cheered for half an hour for years every time he appeared at a secret national committee meeting. In fact, this practice is testified to by the Communists in print; it is said that there was overadulation of Browder. And lo and behold, at the first national committee meeting in June 1945 when he appeared to state his view on the Duclos article only 3 of the 80 that were present would speak to him. I think you will agree that was a very powerful article that Mr. Duclos wrote. Suddenly you can change cheers to social ostracism; not just disagreement. As a matter of fact, Mr. Browder had not yet had an opportunity to speak there, when no one of the committee would talk to him but three, and I was one of the three. I always have had the reputation among the Communists of being a sort of American-trained sap, anyway. I had said that as a newspaperman, I would have to follow the practice of the working press. In order to get cooperation, I could not make faces at those out of step with the Communist Party. I always contended that when you went to a convention as a representative of the press you had to talk to people whether they were friendly or hostile. An exemption was granted me on this ground and I took

advantage of it in this case. I spoke to Browder and I noticed that only two others did at that time. As a matter of fact, he felt this ostracism keenly, because he sat most of the time with his head in his hands.

The reason that I bring this before you is to show in a vivid bird's-eye way the complete subserviency of the Communist leadership here in America to decisions that accord with the wishes, whims, and will of Moscow.

Mr. MUNDR. In that connection, I think it would be helpful at this point if you could make the tie-up, if there is one, between Duclos and Stalin, because the Duclos article brought about this great change.

Mr. BUDENZ. Jacques Duclos is the general secretary of the French Communist Party. Stalin was the general secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and is still its leader. They were all members and officials of the Communist International until the Communist International was declared dissolved. Mr. Browder made the tie-up. He made the tie-up when he said, "Undoubtedly this is the opinion of all leading European Marxists." Anybody that is a trained Communist, and certainly almost anyone else, appreciates the fact that if this is the opinion of European Marxists, it must be the opinion of Stalin as the leading "leading European Marxist"; not only the leading "leading European Marxist" but the leading Marxist of the world, as he has been proclaimed in various resolutions.

I have merely brought these matters up to give the background of what we are considering. Of course, in such a conspiracy as this, you do not have signs around saying, "Kilroy was here." Documentary evidence is very thin, indeed, but there is plenty of other evidence to show this conspiracy, from what I have already indicated; evidence that could be followed up in much more detail, if we had time. But the basic thing that the American people should know is that here is an organization in America that judges all Americans according to their degree of subserviency to the Soviet Union. A leader in America is applauded in proportion as to how he agrees with the particular will of Moscow at any particular time, and the record proves it. This is not something drawn from any oral discussion; this is the record which a study of the Communist press will show.

And, I learned from experience, this conspiracy proceeds to denounce anyone who disagrees with the Soviet policies at any particular time as a Fascist. A Fascist, in Communist lingo, is anyone who disagrees with the Soviet Union, its aims and its aggressions. In that way the title "anti-Fascist" was often conferred on those who had worked actively with Hitler, because now they have turned over to helping the Soviet totalitarianism. As time went on, I learned this as managing editor of the Daily Worker.

I remember very decidedly in the recent past about certain collaborationists who for years were collaborating with Hitler, and I was told to represent one or another of them as anti-Fascist heroes. We will take Rola-Zymierski, the Minister of Defense in the Polish puppet state. Although he had a pro-Fascist record, he had to be portrayed as a leading anti-Fascist. And yet, through all that period, the American workingmen had been told that a non-Fascist was—

Mr. RANKIN (interposing). And in this period you mean when?

Mr. BUDENZ. Any particular period, though I was referring specifically to the latter part of World War II. But I might say that the title "Fascist" depends on whether a public figure disagrees with the Soviet Union: a Fascist, I repeat, is one who disagrees with the Soviet Union, in Communist parlance.

That is what I found out by actual experience in trying to get facts about the collaborationists. There was the case of George Tătărescu of Rumania, whose hands drip with blood of democrats and the Jewish people, who was notoriously helpful to Hitler. He was named Foreign Minister by Vishinsky and has cooperated in the terror there by the combination of brown and red Fascists. Because they were now with the Soviet Union, we were compelled to call them leading anti-Fascists. It's serving the Soviet dictatorship that counts.

That brings me more specifically to the matters at hand.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Budenz, I do not know whether it will distract your attention or not, but as I understand it communism is a system of world revolution, planned world revolution; is that correct?

Mr. BUDENZ. It is, except that today there has been an emphasis which forms itself into an expression of a new phase of this totalitarianism, world domination by conquest. I mean to say that the Soviet dictatorship intends to establish world dictatorship, specifically under the leadership of the Kremlin, specifically under the leadership of Stalin.

Mr. RANKIN. In what way does this form differ from our form of government?

Mr. BUDENZ. That is a long story, Mr. Rankin: rather it would take quite a while. I think that we can say that—

Mr. THOMAS (interposing). I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that that question be reserved.

Mr. RANKIN. I will reserve the question.

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose we let the witness proceed, Mr. Rankin, in his own way.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. BUDENZ. The first thing I have brought forward in a general way is the intent of this Communist conspiracy and what is involved in the Quisling role of the Communist Party. We can see that Foster, the national chairman, was so afraid to express his opinion that he permitted the suppression of his view for fear of expulsion from the party. They would not carry forward the discussion in America; it had to go to "a higher authority." The discussion had to be had through the medium of Jacques Duclos, speaking for Moscow, when the matter came up. And as I have said, Mr. Duclos had the benefit of knowing what the American leaders of the Communist Party were denied, the benefit of the letter written by Foster and the comments made. Of course, it is obvious that there was international communication; there was a continuance of an apparatus like that of the Communist International.

As a matter of fact, Browder had gone to Mexico City a couple of years before, and had expelled most of the members of the national committee in the Mexican party and also the general secretary. And certainly he would not have been able through his own magnetism alone to perform that action. He had powerful credentials for that purpose, the understanding that his act was in accord with Moscow wishes.

I stated in this radio broadcast at Detroit on October 13 that the man representing this international apparatus in the United States was "the equivalent to a representative of the Communist International."

I was officially advised of this fact in those terms by Eugene Dennis, in 1942; sometime in 1942. Dennis was then the representative of the Communist Party's Political Committee to the Daily Worker.

I wish to state to the committee here that I have not as yet had the opportunity to consult the files of the Daily Worker. It is quite possible had I done so that I would have been in an even better position to give dates more specifically, and I shall volunteer to this committee to make it my duty to be more specific by filing a statement later giving the dates in particular months if possible. That will require, however, a study of the files of the Daily Worker. These matters I speak of are referred to indirectly in the Daily Worker, or are connected by associations with events reported in the Daily Worker.

At any rate, Mr. Dennis had been one of those leading Communists who were underground and in hiding for quite a while during the Hitler-Stalin pact. In going under ground he had disappeared completely, except that once in a while I would get a note from him. That note was not even signed with his own hand writing; it was just a type-written note. Of course, there are interoffice memoranda in many organizations, but this was from one of the men you did not see. And, in such notes instructions were given to you from nowhere. Sometimes those instructions came orally from whoever at that time was acting as the liaison officer with the political committee of the Communist Party. You must understand that the political committee always has one of its members act as a representative of the committee to the Daily Worker and he generally sits in with the editorial board for that paper. At least, if he does not always sit in at such meetings he is responsible for communications between the political committee and the Daily Worker.

That person is changed from time to time. For a while, back quite some time, when Hathaway was the editor, this representative was Alex Bittleman; and then it became another person, and so on, as changes were made.

And then after he came out of hiding Dennis became the representative of the political committee—Foster had acted just before that; there was a short interim during which the function lay between Foster and Dennis. And at that time, in 1942, Dennis told me one day that he had to go to Washington, and therefore took up the Berger matter with me. A year before he went under ground, in connection with a secret matter. He had had a conference with me and he was going to Washington again on it—at any rate, Dennis had previously told me about this matter and I must bring this out in order to give the relationship with Berger. Dennis had told me of a "technical difficulty" under which he was suffering and asked my opinion, if I could not use my influence with a certain gentleman in Washington to do something about removing this technical difficulty.

This gentleman's name I shall furnish to the committee in executive session, but he has nothing to do with the Communist Party and it would not be fair to him to bring his name into this public discussion. He was an official here in Washington, and I had known him; I had

known him in the Middle West, and I was asked by Mr. Dennis if I could advise whether that official could help get him out of this technical difficulty.

I said, "It depends entirely on what the technical difficulty is." Generally a Communist does not talk about another's technical difficulty, nor does another comrade disclose his own difficulty unless in great urgency. However, I said, in order to form my judgment I would have to get some idea what the technical difficulty was, in this case. Dennis then said it was somewhat similar to the Krumbein difficulty. He added something about use of "an Irish name." In other words, it looked to me as if Dennis had something like a false passport case, though he did not state that specifically, and that he wanted help in such a case. At all odds he wanted urgent assistance on a "difficulty" or record which he wished removed or remedied.

I told him that I could not recommend the gentleman in Washington because I did not know what his attitude in things like that would be; that he had a general liberal attitude toward the Communist movement, but I could not guarantee what it would be in such a case. Now, later on in 1942—and when I say later on, I will have to check with the Daily Worker files as the exact month—Mr. Dennis came to me again when acting as political committee representative to the Daily Worker, and said, "Do you suppose the man in Washington is still the same in his attitude?" Dennis stated he had to go to Washington and wanted to be informed; and I said something to the effect that all I could say that the official we had talked of was about the same in his views.

MR. RANKIN. Write the name of that man on that paper [indicating] for the committee's use.

MR. THOMAS. Let us get the name in executive session.

MR. RANKIN. Very well.

MR. BUDENZ. And, as I say, and you gentlemen will later learn, that gentleman is not in any way connected with the Communist movement; that he, as a matter of fact, so far as I know, was certainly not always friendly to Communists in his judgment and conduct—that was the reason I spoke of him as I did. Dennis added to me that the case in question was pretty well straightened out. But he went on to say that he had had this matter up with Hans Berger and that it was agreed by them that they should so arrange it that in this instance they should be fully protected. The case should be made airtight.

In connection with his being away from time to time, Dennis said to me that I might occasionally receive instructions and communications from this Hans Berger. Dennis told me further that Berger was strictly underground, and that he was known by Dennis as a responsible comrade who had been in China and Spain and many other places, "including the United States, as you may know."

These were his words, as stated specifically, "That Berger had functioned previously in China, Spain, and here in America, as you may know." Dennis then said that Berger was "equivalent to a representative of the Communist International, and that I was to consider him as such." To advise me fully, Dennis added that Berger's real name was Gerhart Gisler, and that he functioned or was to function among the "German comrades here" as such.

However, he added that I might come to learn that Gisler was a brother of Ruth Fischer, whom Dennis called a Trotskyite, but I was

not to associate him with "such Troskyite filth"; that he was a tried and tested comrade and was therefore a man in a position of authority.

Now, I would like to say to you that in the Communist Party someone who might appear to be in authority would not necessarily be out in the open. It was natural for those actually running the party to be hidden underground. I found this out early in my Communist career.

When I first came into the Communist Party I was one of the best-informed men on the labor movement; I had been editor of Labor Age for years, on whose board were representatives of AFL unions that later formed the CIO; I had been to hundreds of labor union meetings and had become acquainted with many officials who later became national representatives in the labor movement. So that I knew labor men very well. What was my surprise on joining the Communist Party in 1935 and working on the Daily Worker, to find all kinds of mysterious men I had never heard of running the Communist show. They were then located right in the Communist national headquarters—men operating under pseudonyms. There was a man by the name of Edwards; there was a Brown, and there was a Peters—the last man changed his name so much that it kept me busy trying to remember what the name was.

I was frequently embarrassed as to what I was to call him—J. V. Peters, Jack Roberts, or whatever the new name might be.

And I was amazed to find, gentlemen, that there were men here in the American scene who had no stake or interest in America who were directing the running of things Communist. They were at the national headquarters of the Communist Party then, never operating under their right names but under obviously conspiratorial names.

Shortly after I became a member of the Daily Worker staff I was named labor editor of the Daily Worker. That was in late 1935 or early 1936. I had joined in October 1935, as a result of the People's Front program adopted by the Communist International that year, and I was a People's Front Communist. In one of the early meetings I attended as labor editor—or that I attended in being notified I was about to be labor editor—I found out who really runs the Communist organization in this country. It is whoever is the communications officer, who conveys the line, the representative of the Communist International. I came into that meeting of the editorial board of the Daily Worker, unprepared for any such revelation.

When lo and behold to my surprise in walked Mr. Edwards; he did not even introduce himself to the editorial board, but in he walked and proceeded to flay Hathaway for almost an hour, declaring him to be unfit to be editor of the Daily Worker, that he was more interested in his picture on the front page than "he is in running the paper" as it should be run, politically. And I was amazed at this because of Hathaway's position, as represented by the daily press at that time, as one of the Big Three running the party. But Edwards came in, and Edwards was the representative of the Communist International, and he flayed Hathaway, and Hathaway did not do anything but sit there with a silly grin and had to take this trouncing. That was quite an education for me.

I realized that this was not the party it represented it to be, but a puppet apparatus of the Soviet Government. But I said to myself that the big thing now is to beat Hitler and the Axis. When Hitler is overcome, I persuaded myself, the Soviet Union apparatus will

become more democratic. That was the way I deceived myself. As a matter of fact, my experience shows that the Soviet autocracy has become worse, as we shall see. It was pretty astounding to me just the same, at that time, to see that the Communist Party was managed by people who had no connection with American life, that they were simply imported in here in order to control this organization and to command men like Hathaway, who had an American background, that he was to do whatever was wanted by this individual who had the authority from Moscow to tell Hathaway how to act.

And so after that I was open eyed on these matters—oh, by the way, I am satisfied, gentlemen, and were this not a case of dealing with conspiracy, I would say definitely that Edwards was Eisler. I am firmly convinced of it, and I think that further inquiry will show that that is the case. If this were a normal case I would say definitely that it was so, but we are dealing with a conspiracy and in this sort of action it is possible for the Communists to trot out false statements. Although I think we can prove it from the records and files, I will just say that I believe very strongly this man Edwards was Eisler. He did not wear glasses then as now; he did not have the emaciated look of the present at that time. But he had taken quite a beating in the intervening years. As a matter of fact, he actually has the same characteristics, including the peculiar movement of his head as he walks.

The main point is that there was this representative of the Communist International in the office and his name was Edwards; I saw him in action in 1935 and 1936—right along. Then there was Brown, whose real name was Alpi, supposedly an Italian, and many others. Now, as a matter of fact, the Peters mentioned had written a pamphlet for the Communist Party long ago under the name of J. V. Peters, and that places him. As a matter of fact, it was Peters who introduced me to the idea of the conspiratorial apparatus of the Communist Party. He is a pleasant man, too, so far as that goes. He told me that the Communist Party is like a submerged submarine; the part that you see above water is the periscope but the part underneath is the real Communist organization; that is the conspiratorial apparatus.

And, as a matter of fact, I found that there were various rings in this conspiratorial apparatus, and different sections, one of which is the Soviet police system here and another the Communist International apparatus.

Then there is also the use of certain members of the party who normally are in public life, the use of them illegally and secretly, sending them to Latin America, and to Canada, and other places secretly. And, as a matter of fact, sometimes a person who has been a district organizer will suddenly come to you and say that he is going to Mexico or to some other place and by the questions he asks you know he is on a secret mission.

I might state here that the foreign editors of the Daily Worker are very closely in touch with this conspiratorial apparatus of the party, although they do not always know what all individuals are doing. As in all conspiracies the right hand often does not know what the left is doing. Some of the Soviet Government's representatives do not know what is being done by others, as is indicated by what occurred in the Canadian espionage trials where it was disclosed that the Soviet

Ambassador himself did not know in detail of the activities of the military espionage.

A comrade can be pulled out and put in confidential work but at the same time he will not know what others in confidential work are doing.

I know that because I was in confidential work at one time. I had an awful time of it trying to explain to other comrades what I was doing, since I had to conceal my true activities.

When I say I was in confidential work I was not out of the United States, or anything of that sort, but here in the United States I was in confidential work for the party and I can therefore speak with some knowledge on this matter.

Returning to Berger specifically: I did receive from time to time notes sent by him when Dennis was away. These stressed in particular that the second front in Europe was important, and hammered at the importance of talking about the Soviet Union to the American people. Those were some of the notes I recall. There were others, of course, from Berger and from others.

His method of sending notes from hiding places was not peculiar to Eisler-Berger. Stachel had been underground longer than anyone else, for example, and during that time I got notes from him about the things the Daily Worker should do; I got those notes from Stachel largely through Foster, then the liaison officer with the Daily Worker. There were a number of those and I cannot recall them all now, but I can give you one as an example. It was connected with May Day, 1941, for that day we received a communication from abroad which had a peculiar name attached to it that I did not recognize; it was a peculiar name, but it was evidently a very important communication. There was an indication in it that the Soviet Union was disturbed about Hitlers entering Yugoslavia and Greece, and I was eager to know for sure who the author of that statement was. The information was supplied mysteriously from his hiding place by Stachel, who impressed me with the (Dimitroff) article's importance, indicating that it was written by Dimitroff for the Communist International. I got this information through Foster, who said that Stachel stressed that the article should be emphasized by the Daily Worker.

That is an example of what took place, which is remembered by me now because it was a rather important document. I received many other notes from underground, from Dennis, and occasionally from Stachel: more frequently when they were underground I received these communications either through those who were representatives of the political committee to the Daily Worker or through those type-written notes which of course had no signature, but which were known to be genuine from the fact that they came from the ninth floor, because the ninth floor is the national headquarters of the Communist Party. The eighth, incidentally, is the floor of the Daily Worker. These notes came from the ninth floor where the responsible people were known to be located, people responsible for such statements, so far as the Communists were concerned. Some of the notes that I received from Berger were in regard to the Soviet Union, the necessity of emphasizing the Soviet's importance to America, par-

ticularly so-called Soviet democracy. Sometimes this was not so easy, because I was to learn that there was no democracy in the Soviet elections. Particularly in 1943, a striking incident came to my attention that illustrated this. I was advised not to print that some republics had gone so sour that approximately 90 percent of their people were against the Soviet Government. The information then given me was that they were so sour, these republics had to be suppressed. Now, these same republics, if you will look at the elections, really voted 90 to 95 percent for Stalin. Of course they did not have any other ticket to vote for; they had no other choice except that they could have voted against that ticket, but the elections were very overwhelmingly for Stalin. And that information about the "treason" of these republics told me eloquently of the "Ja" character of the Soviet elections.

But the notes from Berger particularly emphasized the necessity of bringing to the American people the alleged democratic character of the Soviet Union, and the language he used was very emphatic. In addition, once in awhile he expressed his opinion very definitely through the political representative of the political committee, who brought instructions from Berger to the Daily Worker. When the question came up of the United States being the Soviet Union's chief foe, as a result of the Duclos article, Berger-Eisler gave what was almost a decision. At that time a dramatic debate took place in the office of the Daily Worker, for 3 weeks, over which I presided as chairman, whether the United States was a hopelessly capitalistic country, in the light of the Duclos article.

James Allen, foreign editor of the Sunday Worker, asserted that the United States was a hopelessly capitalistic country in the light of the Duclos article; Jack Stachel held it was not. And the matter was intensely debated. Suddenly Stachel gave up his position—and even sanctioned a public attack which was made on General MacArthur that he was at first very loath to consent to. In speaking to Stachel about the matter privately I asked him why he had given in. He told me that there was "such a thing as yielding to Browderism, as he might have been doing, and that Berger had thought Allen's views should be permitted."

That meant that "the hopelessly capitalistic country" could only be dealt with as "the hopelessly Fascist country, Nazi Germany," had been treated.

Mr. RANKIN. When was that attack on General MacArthur?

Mr. BUDENZ. The attack on General MacArthur came from the Philippine underground of the Communist Party. It was printed—I am trying to approximate exactly when it was—in the fall of 1945; it was around the discussion of the Duclos article, the discussion which appeared in September, August, or September of 1945. The attack can be found in the files of the Daily Worker.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, could the committee recess for about 10 minutes in order for the witness to rest his voice?

Mr. Wood. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to get a copy of the attack on General MacArthur.

Mr. BUDENZ. That is in the files of the Daily Worker; there was a series of articles, but it constituted a very violent attack on MacArthur.

(Whereupon a short recess was taken.)

The CHAIRMAN. Let the committee be in order, please.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, at the conclusion of his statement this afternoon, I will get up and ask on the record that you adjourn the hearing to a future date to be set.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. Let us proceed.

Mr. BUDENZ. There are two observations I would now like to make. One is that necessarily, even in this extended testimony and covering a period of years, and also when things are by notes or oral communications, necessarily I will forget a number of things. I therefore will file with the committee later written supplements to this testimony, in addition to references to documents and the dates.

Mr. RANKIN. Can you do it right away?

Mr. BUDENZ. Well, it may take a little while. I feel the necessity of consulting the files of the Daily Worker which, to my mind, do suggest events, and I have not had the opportunity to do so. Then besides, here today, there is so much of the material at my disposal that I am going to omit some of it by accident.

I want to point, however, to two things in my experience. One is this: I have mentioned Clarence Hathaway and his relationship to Edwards, but I have not mentioned other things about Hathaway. These matters throw further light on the illegal Communist activities.

Mr. Hathaway advised me very definitely, early in my career in the party, that Earl Browder was practically a megaphone for someone else. It was in 1939 in the back part of the room in a national committee meeting. Mr. Hathaway told me "Don't get it in your head that Jack Stachel and Earl Browder originate these ideas they bring forward. They represent things which are presented to them by other people." That was pretty strong evidence early in my party experience of direction from abroad, which I found out later was carried to one or two leading comrades. Continuing on the matter before us, I want to point out, when I spoke about illegal activities, I did not just mean this business of false passports or of one or two instances even of that.

For instance, there was Harry Gannes, late foreign editor of the Daily Worker. He was about to be convicted of false passports when he died of a brain tumor. His death was hastened by fear and worry. I worked in the same office with him at the time and know that most of his trouble was not fear of America, nor fear of an American prison, but fear of people back of him in the Communist conspiratorial apparatus. He feared he would have to divulge some of the shadowy figures with whom he worked for the Kremlin. As a matter of fact, there is one thing I noticed constantly in regard to Communist leadership and that was fear. I have seen Earl Browder look like he was struck with a most intense fright on more than one occasion, and Jack Stachel looks as though somebody was chasing him all the time. This fear is not of America, it is not even a sense of fear of imprisonment in America, it is this peculiar shadow back of those people that puts fright into their hearts, or whatever it is. Maybe it is a feeling of their obligation to the Soviet dictators. I am not going to analyze it, but it does represent a sense of fear.

Mr. MUNDT. I wish you would have a little description of Jack Stachel put in the record at this point. I do not know anything about him.

MR. ADAMSON. Mr. Stachel appeared before the committee last year, Mr. Mundt.

MR. MUNDT. I was not at that meeting.

MR. ADAMSON. And we have his testimony.

MR. BUDENZ. Mr. Stachel—I really do not care much to go into detail on that. My relations with him have been personally very excellent. He has some fine qualities, including a very quick mind, and I generally call him the Communist Vicar of Bray; that is to say, he always lands on his feet no matter what the party line is. And back of this is a certain efficiency personally and a certain ability to get things done. However, I do know that he has a shadow, likewise, in back of him in the conspiratorial apparatus of other persons who command him. I have seen instances of this which I will have to give to the committee, however, at the moment in executive sessions, but later on they may be divulged publicly, if the committee decides that is advisable.

Secondly, as I have said, when I spoke about certain illegal activities I did not mean those mentioned are all of the picture by far. But I have referred here to those things which are on American court or other formal records, such as the conviction of Browder, Gitlow's passport, the conviction of William Weiner, Charles Krumhein, and other things of that character involving perjury or false passports. However, in back of this is the entire illegal apparatus, consisting, in some instances, of the assassination of those who disagree. This came to my attention early, when I first took up work with the Daily Worker. One of these instances was of the former American school teacher, Julia Stuart Poyntz, who disappeared from the streets of New York into thin air. She had been at one time very active in the Communist Party, had then worked with the secret apparatus, but was turning sour. When she disappeared the party was assailed for this act, and I said in an editorial-board meeting that a public defense should be made. But Hathaway drew me out of the office, I remember, that day and said: "This is hot cargo. It might injure some of our comrades, and we cannot discuss it." And it was never discussed by the Communist press.

Then there was the case of Ignatz Maria Reiss, a noted Communist who was kidnaped and killed. The New Republic one day, to the great pain of the Communists, began to raise the question of the Reiss case very mildly. They said something was wrong there. I do not remember the exact date, but I do remember my participation in the discussion in the Daily Worker, and I was very much disturbed about this accusation. I felt we should make answers to these attacks even though it was not prominently played up in the editorial in the New Republic. I mean to say it was not a major editorial. Again Hathaway—I am sure it was he, because I recollect he was the only one who discussed those matters with me, and he said once again that this was something we were not permitted to discuss; that it was too hot to handle for us.

MR. RANKIN. Was that somebody who disappeared?

MR. BUDENZ. He disappeared in Europe; he was a well-known Communist and, if I remember correctly, got into a dispute with the secret apparatus, suddenly went "sour," as the expression is, and I think even made a public gesture of his sourness. He was found killed in Europe. He was kidnaped and killed.

MR. RANKIN. What happened to the other party you mentioned before that?

MR. BUDENZ. I don't know; she just went off and disappeared.

MR. RANKIN. Has she been found yet?

MR. BUDENZ. No; she disappeared. She evaporated from the streets of New York; that was the fate of an American citizen.

Of course, disappearances of this kind are not unusual in Soviet circles. There is the strange case of Yezhov, of which something should be mentioned. I hope you won't think I am trying to indulge in humor in relating what follows, because it is most serious. But this was an illustration to me of how things happen in the Soviet Union. When I was editor of the Midwest Daily Record, Communist-created paper, I did not have time to look into every nice political question on Soviet events. So I asked William L. Patterson, who had been in the English section of the Communist International in Moscow to watch those things for us. One day I wished to run a picture of Russian generals, and took out a picture of a number of such generals from the newspaper morgue. I asked Patterson if the picture could be used; was it O. K.? "Oh, that can't be used," he replied, "Yezhov is in that picture. He is now an enemy of the Soviet Union." Now, I knew we did not hear of Yezhov any more but I did not know he had been declared an enemy of the Soviet Union. But I said, "Fortunately, Yezhov is on the end of the picture and we can cut him off," and I took him off and ran the picture of the other generals. Yet, what were the facts about Yezhov? He was the head of the secret police of the Soviet who had conducted the big death purges and he was a great hero. In fact, they called the secret police after him. But he had disagreed with the Kremlin dictatorship, and one day he walked up to Leningrad and has never been heard of since. And while Yezhov, who was one of the heroes of the Soviet Union, disappears in that strange and mysterious fashion, it is known here he is an enemy of the Soviet Union and they cannot mention his name any more in the Daily Worker, the Midwest Daily Record, or anywhere else in the Communist press. And over the years, we were suddenly confronted with Soviet heroes that we found did not appear any more anywhere, and we had to be silent about it, and there was no explanation at all as to what happened to them. But it was known here, through the secret channels of international communication, that these men were "enemies of the Soviet Union."

Then there was also the name of Yenikidze, who was a great friend of Stalin, who engineered, if I remember correctly, the first "Jo" election in the Soviet Union, where 95 percent was for the election of Stalin. He was jailed and killed there without trial, but we knew he was an enemy of the Soviet Union, in Communist circles here.

And so over and over I can repeat instance after instance of these people who were heroes and became enemies of the Soviet Union, killed or disappeared.

MR. THOMAS. How about a former general of the Soviet Union whose body was found up here in a Washington hotel—Krivitsky?

MR. BUDENZ. I know nothing about that. I only speak, you know, Mr. Congressman, of what I know. Of course, if I do not know, that does not mean that everything is O. K. about Krivitsky, either, although I would not want to state what I am not certain of. The reason

for that lack of knowledge is that plenty of things happen within Communist secret rings that a leading Communist may not know about. As I say, the right hand in a conspiracy never lets the left hand know what it does.

Now, I want to call the attention of this committee to the fact that I have copies of the Communist here in my possession which show the leading position of Gerhard Eisler as Hans Berger. These articles prove his high rank, for they are on vital subjects in the theoretical organ of the Communist Party. These articles range from a signed article by him in November 1942 on Twenty-Five Years of Soviet Power—published along with articles by Earl Browder, general secretary of the party, and V. J. Jerome, editor of the Communist—over to a number of very important contributions on “foreign policy.” They are written by a man of authority, it’s clear. Among them, significantly, is an article on the dissolution of the Communist International, to which I shall later refer because of its deep importance, and one rebutting Foster’s original rebellion against Browder. The latter was published in April 1944, in the guise of an answer to Max Lerner of PM.

They show Hans Berger to be a well-known Communist, entrusted with the most outstanding problems. In addition to those he also wrote in the Daily Worker, but mainly there on the German problem, for the reason that the Daily Worker is more of a mass paper and it was not wise to show Berger too openly or fully as such in its pages.

Now, there have been some statements by Mr. Berger-Eisler in the press, trying to get out of the position in which these articles place him. And I have to take some notice of some of these statements right in the beginning. In the first place, Eisler met my first declaration about his place as Communist International representative, or its equivalent, by saying that he didn’t know who “this mysterious Hans Berger is.” Later on he admitted it was himself, but that he had written these articles through a ghost writer, who turned out to be Joseph Starobin, the foreign editor of the Daily Worker. Now, that was merely a red herring across the trail, for Starobin’s job is to rewrite (or have someone else rewrite) all copy that comes into the Daily Worker on foreign affairs.

In the Communist, Berger-Eisler has written as “the equivalent to a representative of the Communist International,” which Dennis said he was. The Communist is the theoretical organ of the Communist Party, as I have stated and want to emphasize. It is for the “inner circle.” When I say “inner circle” I do not mean to imply that you cannot buy it through regular channels, because you can subscribe and buy it. The purpose is to educate the more active Communists. And, by the way, it was also contended by Mr. Eisler that he was a refugee over here, merely in transit. Is it not amazing that a refugee in transit in America can suddenly appear with Earl Browder as writing an article entitled “Twenty-Five Years of Soviet Power.” No other refugee is picked up off the streets and treated so splendidly in the Communist press.

Mr. ADAMSON. Explain what you mean by “in transit.” You mean he is here on an in-transit visa?

Mr. BUDENZ. He claimed—I do not know technically; I have not closely followed his defense, but the point of the matter is he admits he has committed “technical perjury” in coming to this country say-

ing he was in transit—in transit to Mexico. His perjury was that he swore he was not a Communist; now he admits he was.

MR. ADAMSON. Then he had received a visa to come to the United States?

MR. BUDENZ. That I do not know.

THE CHAIRMAN. Who is that you are talking about?

MR. BUDENZ. Hans Berger.

MR. ADAMSON. He did not come here on a visa?

MR. BUDENZ. I do not know; he just makes the claim he came here on an in-transit visa on his way to Mexico. He claimed he was on his way to Mexico, but he could not get into Mexico, he says, because Austrians and Germans were not admitted. I think anyone who would perjure himself on his political status to get into America would perjure himself as to his nationality if he wanted to get into Mexico. The general inference is the United States was where he wanted to land.

The point of the matter is I want to call your attention to the fact, nevertheless, and I submit it to the committee, that in November 1942, in *The Communist*, Hans Berger joined with Earl Browder and V. J. Jerome in an article entitled "Twenty-Five Years of Soviet Power," and in that he handles it as though he were an American. He speaks about "our Nation discovers the Soviet Union." And what is "our Nation"? The United States Government. Of course, we must understand he would partly justify this as a Communist way of doing things, because of the fact this is supposed to be instructions to American Communists; therefore he associates himself with them. He acts like an American, declares his readers. He speaks of "our Nation discovers the Soviet Union," and even endorses certain American leaders, some of whom are not now in the good graces of the Communist Party: that is the reason I will not cite them here, thinking it is unjust to quote them. At any rate, he states "that the Soviet Union was a land constituting the bulwark of civilization and progress" and likewise he emphasizes the value of the Soviet Union at that particular time. I am not entering into his argument here, although that could be done: I am merely bringing to your attention emphatically the fact it is queer for a refugee to appear in America in transit to Mexico and suddenly write, along with Earl Browder, in *The Communist*, which is the ideological organ or theoretical organ of the Communist Party. It is impossible. Berger is no refugee.

MR. ADAMSON. Will you submit these documents into the record, Mr. Budenz?

MR. BUDENZ. Yes. I will submit all issues of the *Communist* in which Hans Berger wrote, to my knowledge. I wish to call your attention, in order not to take up the whole time of the committee with this to a few more, only, of these articles. One of them is for May 1944, and that shows Berger's standing beyond doubt. We will bear in mind that William Z. Foster had jumped the traces of the line and had been reprimanded and his report suppressed, and Foster was compelled to keep silence under fear of being expelled. And taking advantage of an article by Max Lerner, Hans Berger writes an article in the *Communist* of May 1944, criticizing Foster's views but under the guise of criticizing Lerner. And in that way—of criticizing Max Lerner's charge of betrayal against Browder—he can criticize Foster. Foster, as I say, was ahead of the procession in the great guessing game

as to what Moscow would do. Now, in this article Berger takes up in detail the Tehran agreement and its promises, exactly what the Communists stand for, and says "Browder realizes that in its dominant sections American monopoly capital supports the war." In other words, I am quoting this and some other things, and I refer to that and some other things to show this was a statement of what the Communists should believe, as well as what they did believe. This was certainly not written by a Communist on his way to Mexico, stopping off here; it was a responsible and dominant person writing the article. In proof of that, I can say that Berger's is one of the very few pseudonyms to appear in the American Communist Party's theoretical organ. There are a few there, but none so conspicuous as his.

Mr. RANKIN. Where was he from?

Mr. BUDENZ. He was in America then—and now.

Mr. RANKIN. Where did he come from?

Mr. BUDENZ. Hans Berger?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. BUDENZ. Offhand I could not tell you. I only know what I have been told. In this respect his description again agrees with the description of Edwards; that is, he is from Germany or Austria, and was a well-known comrade there before his activities in China, Spain, and here. And what Eugene Dennis said to me in 1942 indicated definitely he had been here before.

Mr. THOMAS. When did he first come to the United States, as far as you know?

Mr. BUDENZ. The first time, of course, was the case of Edwards which, I am still convinced, was Eisler.

Mr. THOMAS. What was the approximate date?

Mr. BUDENZ. That would not place his coming: that was my going into the party. He was there, in national headquarters then. That was in June 1935, or early in 1936.

Mr. THOMAS. Then you know him as Hans Berger when for the first time?

Mr. BUDENZ. As Hans Berger, I knew him somewhat earlier than the Dennis statement of 1942, but I will say there are all sorts and ways of getting information in the Communist movement, especially of one is editor of the official organ.

Mr. THOMAS. Approximately?

Mr. BUDENZ. I do not remember now who told me, because so much information came to me. But it was early in 1942. That is, I had some knowledge of Berger before the date of this Dennis interview. At any rate, it also was in 1942. Dennis confirmed officially what I already knew.

Mr. THOMAS. Was not Berger an active Communist in Germany at one time?

Mr. BUDENZ. That is what Dennis said—he is a veteran comrade, "tried and trusted in Germany, Austria, Spain, China, and here, as you know."

Mr. THOMAS. Was not he an active Communist in Germany at the time of the Reichstag fire?

Mr. BUDENZ. That I do not know from my own knowledge, even from anyone's representations to me.

Now, I want to get here to the dissolution of the Communist International and the article on it by Berger-Eisler in the Communist. This is the issue, by the way, the discussion of which I happened to be in on in part, and I know how this issue was framed. It is very interesting. Mr. Berger's name does not appear on the cover, but whose name does appear is Dmitri Z. Manuilsky. I was present partly by accident, because I was there on other matters when V. J. Jerome, who is the editor of the Communist in reality, and Eugene Dennis discussed this matter of the Communist International. We discussed it in the theoretical and ideological language which the Communist used, and to which I wish to refer a bit later, and thereby the Communists conceal from you the real nature of their directives, although these are clear to their own trained Communists.

This issue we were discussing was the one that discussed the Communist International, and the question was how it should be discussed. And it was agreed that Mr. Berger should write this piece which he did write, in order to show to our comrades that internationalism still lives—"internationalism still lives" was the phrase used—even with the dissolution of the Communist International. And in order to drive that home, i was decided o put in a prominent article by Dmitri Z. Manuilsky on "The Glorious Victories of the Red Army" because every trained Commnnist knows that Dmitri Manuilsky represents leadership of the Communist International even to this day. That was the understanding which prompted his open threat to the United Nations recently of the power of the Communist parties throughout the world. That is the speech that is putting every party on its toes and was the signal from the Communist International. Manuilsky should know all about these matters for every trained Communist knows he roughly runs every Communist Party through the continued international channels of communication. Even when George Dimitrov was leader, Foster told me—and he was guilty of a pun about it—that Dimitrov may be the head but Dmitri is the heart of the Communist International. That is a fact; Manuilsky represents what now is the equivalent of the Communit International, and let us understand this.

Mr. RANKIN. Is he in this country now?

Mr. BUDENZ. I guess he is a guest of the United States, and so is Mr. Molotov, incidentally.

Mr. RANKIN. Who is that?

Mr. BUDENZ. Molotov is also a guest—the Foreign Minister of the U. S. S. R., the gentleman who stands for a world proletarian dictatorship, for world domination.

And so it was agreed, and this is the point—it was agreed that Manuilsky's article should be put in The Communist and Berger should make his explanation in order that all well-advised Communists would know that "internationalism still lives," even with the dissolution of the Communist International. But that was the explanation which was revealed everywhere very vigorously, that "internationalism still lives even after the dissolution of the Communist International."

I will only mention one thing, that while the apparatus of the Communist International is changed somewhat and it might not appear so vividly and would not be admitted as existent, its functions go

on, its communications and personnel substantially remain in operation.

Mr. RANKIN. In other words, the Comintern has not been abolished?

Mr. BUDENZ. It has not been abolished in fact. I have other evidence of that, if I can recall it, and I may just a moment; but everywhere responsible Communists, as they are designated, retail this idea in just these words, sometimes with a smile even, that "the Communist International has been dissolved, but internationalism is not dead, and our association with the great fatherland of workers, the Soviet Union, is not dead." It exists just the same and "we are loyal to all of it." This use of the "fatherland of workers," incidentally, is a quotation from William Z. Foster made down here a number of years ago, when in a congressional committee hearing he proclaimed the Soviet Union as his fatherland and the Soviet flag as his flag.

Mr. THOMAS. That was late in 1939, when he and Browder came before the old Dies committee, and in answer to a question put to them by the chairman of that committee they said if a war came between the United States and Russia, their loyalty would be to Russia. And is not that true today, just as much as it was true then?

Mr. BUDENZ. It is true today, and it is proved by just reading the Communist publications. The measure of every American leader, according to their idea, is the degree with which he either represents or the degree with which he agrees with the current Soviet policy, and an American leader becomes either damned or praised and trusted according to his association with Soviet policies at any particular time. I gave you Mr. Roosevelt as exhibit A.

Mr. THOMAS. So, if there should be a war today or at some time in the future between the United States and Russia, those leaders and all of the other Communists would have their loyalty with Russia. Is not that true?

Mr. BUDENZ. Most decidedly. That is their only loyalty and, as I say, the proof of it is—I do not want to make any charges that are based on oral testimony but the proof of it is the Communist publications themselves—their own change of line in accordance with the wish of Russia; their praise of the Soviet leadership, even after the dissolution of the Communist International, their judgment of leaders in America on the basis of their friendship or subservience to Soviet government desires. I cannot take up all of the time by confirming this, but that can be found by examination of every Communist resolution, every Communist public meeting, and every Communist publication.

Mr. THOMAS. So that every Communist in this country is a Russian fifth columnist?

Mr. BUDENZ. He is a member of the Russian fifth column, which is as much so as the Nazi Bund was to Germany, except operating more subtly and more effectively. I want to say this, however, that of course a number of the rank and file Communists are not fully cognizant of this; also I have presented quotes from certain Communist leaders showing they exercise a certain casuistry in back of their writings, to conceal this Quisling rule. If time permitted, I could bring overwhelming evidence before this committee, quoting issue after issue of the Daily Worker, and of this publication [indicating

the Communist], of their loyalty to Russia and their criticism of American leaders and what they believe about American policy based on servility to Soviet aims alone.

Let me give you one striking example of this. Have you ever seen a Communist publication that even found one fault in Joseph Stalin? He cannot make any mistakes. Yet the American leaders are shuttled back and forth in the Communist press, brow-beaten, even called abusive terms. The Communists slander, lie, and are abusive to these Americans because these men expressed some criticism of Soviet objectives. But can Stalin be attacked in that press? They cannot even find a small fault to speak of, or discuss any weakness of his in the course of his long career. He is without any defect, says the Communist press in effect.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Budenz, here is a statement made to the committee by the gentleman that the gentleman from New Jersey referred to. He said:

No Communist, no matter how many votes he should secure in a national election could, even if he would, become President of the present Government.

That is the Government of the United States. He says:

When a Communist heads the Government of the United States—and that day will come just as surely as the sun rises—that Government will not be a capitalistic government, but a soviet government and behind that government will stand the Red Army to enforce the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Does not that express the policies of the Communist Party?

Mr. BUDENZ. That expresses the present policy of the Soviet Union, veneered over with the appearance of working in the United Nations, but using the United Nations as a sounding board to discredit and belittle the United States and the American Nation.

Mr. RANKIN. Does that express also the policies of the Communist Party in the United States as it now exists?

Mr. BUDENZ. That expresses the policies of the Communist Party of the United States as they now exist and as is disclosed by these recent discussions which the party does not make public largely for legal and tactical reasons. We must understand that the Communist Party withdrew from the Communist International for such tactical reasons, ahead of the Communist International dissolution. And that, I think incidentally, is the reason why Dennis told me at that time that Berger is the equivalent of a representative here of the Communist International. I do not know—there may have been other reasons—but that I think was his reason, because the party was not supposedly in the Communist International, but the International existed.

Mr. RANKIN. And, by the way, Foster is still the head?

Mr. BUDENZ. He is now the head of the party here. There is this thought that I was about to express in regard to Foster, however. As I have said, the Comintern and the Soviet Government keep two leaders alive in each country. Usually one is left and one is right, so that when it is necessary they can take one out and keep the other back. For instance, Litvinov symbolizes that policy. They go in and out like weather vanes. When the weather is clear, on American relations, Litvinov comes out and when the weather is bad, Litvinov goes back in. So it is with the Communist leadership here and elsewhere.

Browder has been salvaged and made the representative of the Soviet book trusts here. There are three big Soviet book trusts.

And he can now function in perhaps a better position than he ever did before. For instance, he can write for the New York Times now as an ex-Communist and he can also be put on the radio frequently. And he can be thus kept on ice for a return to the secretaryship of the party, in case it is necessary to smooth down the course of relationships with the U. S. A. a little bit.

Likewise, in England, Pollett—Harry Pollett was thrown out and R. Palme Dutt was put in. Then Dutt was thrown out and Pollett is back in again. Those are changes which are made right along.

MR. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, it is now almost 12 o'clock and I suggest that we recess.

MR. BUDENZ. I just wanted to complete my thought on this matter, although it could be explored further, and that is in connection with these articles of Hans Berger in the Communist of which I have pointed to three very important ones, very decisive ones; one on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Soviet Union, where he is given his proper rank, by being associated with Browder; and secondly, in regard to the action taken with reference to Foster, and the statement that was made, which only a person with authority would make. That was in May 1944. As Foster had been a dissident, he had written a letter to the national committee. This letter had been suppressed. It was necessary to suppress Foster's ideas within the party for the time being, and Berger-Eisler brought his authority to bear.

For instance, you do not take a Joseph Starobin, the foreign editor of the Daily Worker, and make him write an article of that kind, because Starobin has not got that authority. But you take Hans Berger, and he writes it out, and Starobin may turn it into better English for him. That is one thing that the foreign editor of the Daily Worker very frequently does, as has been said. I do not know that he did in connection with these articles, because V. J. Jerome is perfectly capable of editing articles very well. In fact, sometimes he gives one a pain with the way he edits articles, he is so precise. But he does edit articles and I know that Mr. Jerome has rewritten sections of articles at the request of certain people, although they did not write them themselves. I have helped Jerome on such matters. I have in mind an article by John Williamson, where he furnishes a great deal of information, but the article as it was published merely confirmed the conclusions of Williamson; that is, they were not new conclusions. Much of the expression in the article was changed, however. They were Williamson's conclusions, but he at that time was in Cleveland, and Jerome asked me to handle certain details and rewriting on a large scale.

So that, as to these articles, I do not know who smoothed them out, but Berger wrote them and I was present when the discussion of one article was in hand and Berger-Eisler was the person involved.

Then there are the Daily Worker articles. These came to the Daily Worker, and they did not come through Starobin, who Berger makes his ghost writer. They came to the Daily Worker largely through Stachel. In fact, after Stachel became the representative of the political committee on the Daily Worker, communication with Berger seemed to increase; at least, I was more conscious of it. The written communications from Berger fell down, but the knowledge that Stachel was in consultation with Berger increased. Every once

in a while Stachel said that he was going out and discuss this question with Berger and he brought out certain documents with him on those occasions and also brought the modest pay which Berger received from the Daily Worker for his articles.

The point is this, that these articles in the Daily Worker—just to bring this point to a head—were sent in in Germanized English. Naturally I am not reflecting on Germanized English because of my own origins, but the point is that they were in Germanized English and they had to be straightened out and Starobin had the job of seeing that they were straightened out and even I, when Starobin was ill, once had three of these articles. Of course, this was the type of work on the Daily Worker, which the Daily Worker staff—even I—regarded as a headache, this business of rewriting articles which had accents to them, for the simple reason that it is most difficult to make it precise and be sure that you have the same thought. So that I was greatly relieved when we learned that the articles were to be sent back, because the line had changed somewhat between the time that they were written and the time that they were to be published. I recall that very well because at that time Starobin was either too busy or was ill.

MR. THOMAS. Professor, do you make the point that Hans Berger is the No. 1 Communist in the United States, that Browder and Foster are just figureheads in the Communist Party here?

MR. BUDENZ. I make these two statements because I want to divide this. One, Hans Berger or Gerhardt Eisler, the brother of Ruth Fischer—because he was so designated to me and so I knew him, understanding that Ruth Fischer and he has different ideas—this Hans Berger or Eisler is the equivalent to the representative of the Communist International. I was so officially informed—that he is the chief communication officer and that he is likewise vested with a certain authority such as was exercised when Edwards took Hathaway over the coals.

Of course, you must understand that with this authority there are limitations and conditions in matters of this character. But nevertheless the official representative of the Communist International is the chief communication officer who brings the line of the party over, who knows it, and who, in addition to that, is vested with a certain authority to intervene in party affairs if he judges that necessary. Of course, I do not know just what are all the limitations, but he intervened in some matters in the case of the Daily Worker, or in the case of Hathaway. Naturally when the representative was underground he could not interfere in person because physically he was not around the Daily Worker building. Dennis had advised me that he could not come to the building, and never did come, to my knowledge.

MR. THOMAS. Can he dictate to Browder and Foster?

MR. BUDENZ. That is the second point. Browder and Foster have no life except that which is granted them by Moscow—no political life of their own. I want to illustrate this by what happens in the Communist Party, to show you how this works out. For instance, Browder used to go back and forth to Moscow, and every time he came back, there was a new line. A classical case that I remember—I was not in the party then, I was just on the eve of getting it—but there was a conference on unemployment insurance in Washington in January 1935, and they were denouncing the idea of a Labor Party.

The Communists were fighting tooth and nail against it when, lo and behold, Browder arrives on a ship from Moscow, rushes to Washington and declares that anyone who is against the Labor Party is anathema; that anyone who is opposed to the Labor Party is opposed to the interests of the workers and the labor movement. And the Communists flip-flopped over and became just as enthusiastic in 2 minutes for the Labor Party as they had been bitterly opposed to it all along before.

Now, we are sensible people. We know that Browder did not go to Moscow for the fun of it. He went to get the line on the Labor Party and he came back with it. That happened over and over again. The connection of these people to the Communists International Organization proves it. Foster sat on the executive committee for years with Stalin—the executive committee of the Communist International. They were committed to the same thing. They were committed to the dictatorship and anyone who did not agree with the Stalin policy received the fate of Gitlow and others. Gitlow, you are aware, was deposed from American leadership of the party by Stalin personally—and that took place in Moscow. But Foster and Browder did not receive that fate. They were good servants.

If you will read some of the communications, and notice the way William Z. Foster begged for leadership in the United States, in the official records, as printed in the International Press Correspondence, you will understand who is the boss of the American Communist Party. In Moscow, at the time when the lid was off, and there was less discretion used, and the party had not formed itself so firmly in discipline, Foster was there making his plea for leadership, pleading with the leaders over there to try to get their O. K. for him to be the leader over here. And there are many stories around the Communist movement of the lobbying that was done by this American Communist and that with Bucharin and Stalin and other leaders to get their O. K. to be the leader over here.

Mr. THOMAS. That does not answer my question specifically.

Mr. BUDENZ. What was your question?

Mr. THOMAS. My question was, Can Hans Berger dictate to Foster and Browder?

Mr. BUDENZ. Of course he can. As a matter of fact, I will tell the committee in executive session how even another underground gentleman can dictate to Browder, and how it was done.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will recess until 1:30.

(Whereupon a recess was taken until 1:30 p. m.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

The recess having expired, the committee reconvened at 1:30 p. m., Hon. John S. Wood (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order. Professor Budenz, the members of the committee doubtless will have a considerable number of questions to ask you, but we will postpone that until you have finished your statement. So you may feel perfectly free to proceed at this time.

FURTHER STATEMENT OF LOUIS F. BUDENZ

Mr. BUDENZ. In the first place, there are several odds and ends that I omitted that I would like to introduce here into the hearing. One of them is this: I mentioned, in the first place, the fact that the Communist Party has never disagreed with the Stalinite line at any time, nor with Stalinite-endorsed individuals.

But I would like to point out something even sharper than that. That is that for many years, including the first part of my being in the Daily Worker, the Daily Worker was subsidized directly by the Soviet Government. That is well known, but the method is not generally appreciated.

That is to say, the Runag News Agency of Moscow sent to the Daily Worker every day thousands of words free of charge. We know how high the cable charge is from Moscow for each word of news. This was paid for by the Runag Agency; namely, the Soviet Government.

During the Trotzkyite-Bucharinist trials literally hundreds of thousands of words came in, translated into English for the convenience of the Daily Worker, and all of that work was paid for—the cables sent over directly from Moscow—by Moscow. This was not stopped by the Soviet Government. It was stopped by the Department of Justice declaring that the paper would have to file as a foreign agent if it continued to receive this information free of charge. Of course, that would be very bad for the Communists to file as foreign agents. It would disclose the purpose of the organization. So that had to be discontinued.

Then the Intercontinent News was formed by the Communists and received these wires for a while and relayed them to the Daily Worker and, of course, to some other people. That finally had to be stopped because likewise the Intercontinent News was supposed to be required to file as a foreign agent. I wanted to supplement that information on Soviet subsidies to what has been said before on this point.

Secondly, I want to point out how well information comes to the Communist Party from abroad and how well events are being foreshadowed, at least in regard to certain things Moscow wants the Communists here to know. I will give as an example that I had of a cable from the British Daily Worker at the time that Dr. Ivan Subasitch, the Literal, was supposed to go to Yugoslavia to become a part of the Tito government. We received a cable from the London Daily Worker asking what the status of Subasitch was. At that time Duram Landy was in charge of this type of work, dealing with all matters of that character. Landy at that time said that this was a very indiscrete cable from London and, beyond that, he stated that this cable had to be answered in a very careful way.

The point of the matter is that the cable was answered, but by a letter which was more to the point than the cable we sent, which was rather noncommittal, giving the opinion on Subasitch, "according to certain Slav organizations." At that time Subasitch was going to be brought into the political machinery of Yugoslavia, in order to double-cross him. That is to say, Subasitch, in the short run would be all right, but in the long run was not to be relied upon. And that was what the London Daily Worker was told in advance.

Now, I had intelligence enough at least to reason this out, that Subasitch was going to remain there in Yugoslavia for certain purposes and would be all right, and then later was slated for decapitation, which was what took place.

Mr. RANKIN. Do you mean he was physically executed?

Mr. BUDENZ. No, I do not; I mean politically executed.

This brings up another point in which Berger-Eisler plays some part. In fact, it is with very great reluctance that I raise this issue—and I do not even know how to do it—because it involves my own corruption of a friend; that is, political corruption, a thing which I have regretted very much ever since. That is, that I, as I acted then a Communist—because I certainly do not want to pretend that I, as a Communist, did not participate in Communist activities. But this was the case of Louis Adamic, who is not a Communist, but who is certainly following the Communist line.

Now, in his case, we had been very close friends, and if you will read his books, you will see that he commends me for my public activity, especially in the labor movement. So this is not in any sense an attack upon Mr. Adamic. What he is doing is well known. It is in the public eye and therefore I cannot throw any more light on it.

What I am trying to point out is how Communists try to corrupt people of this character; I mean, politically.

Louis Adamic had been a member of the William Allen White committee and was certainly at one time anti-Communist. When I met him again, he was still anti-Tito, to a great degree and it was my assignment to see that Adamic was changed over.

Mr. RANKIN. How long has that been?

Mr. BUDENZ. I will have to check that.

Mr. RANKIN. About how long; just approximately—a year, 2 years, or 5 years?

Mr. BUDENZ. No, not 5 years. This was within the last 3 years.

Mr. RANKIN. Within the last 3 years?

Mr. BUDENZ. Well, it can easily be placed by the Saturday Evening Post article, in which he was still not pro-Tito.

Mr. RANKIN. You say that he is not a Communist, but follows the Communist line?

Mr. BUDENZ. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. That is like the difference between a man being drunk and being intoxicated.

Mr. BUDENZ. Well, of course, there are several reasons for this. Certain people are not wanted in the party, to start with, for one. Secondly, as a matter of fact, Adamic was not told, regarding his activities, that he must join the Communist Party; he was told not to join the Communist Party. He was looked on as sort of unreliable by the Communists and would sway back and forth, and it was thought that he could be more influenced by not giving him a party membership. However, he did not ask, personally, to be a member. I want to make that clear.

Mr. RANKIN. But he is following the Communist line and carrying on Communist propaganda.

Mr. BUDENZ. In regard to Yugoslavia, yes. And also he is showing that in regard to his attack upon the Irish and the Catholics in his

latest book, Nation of Nations, which is the Communist line today in regard to that subject. I wish to develop that in just a moment.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, but did he not, before 3 years ago, write some things that were just as communistic as anything he has written in the last 3 years?

Mr. BUDENZ. I do not want to go into that, because that has nothing to do with my present experience, if you please, Congressman. The point of the matter is that—

Mr. THOMAS. But you say he was not a Communist?

Mr. BUDENZ. No; he was not.

Mr. RANKIN. You mean he was not a member of the party.

Mr. BUDENZ. Not only that, he was even hostile to the party, to a certain degree.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I think it would be a good idea right at this point in the record to insert some of Louis Adamic's writings. There are some poems that we have in our files that certainly show that he was very communistic and that he certainly follows the Communist line.

Mr. BUDENZ. I cannot go into that without full information. I had known him from earlier days in the labor movement, but at the time that I met him again he was not pro-Tito and not pro-Soviet policy in Europe. He became that way after repeated visits from me and repeated visits with me from Landy, which brings me to this other matter about Berger-Eisler.

Mr. RANKIN. And, Mr. Budenz, you say, though, that he follows the Communist line, and from your statement there that he is antireligious?

Mr. BUDENZ. I did not say that he was antireligious. I said that he is now following the line in regard to the present tactics of the Communists in regard to the Catholics, which I will outline in just a minute.

Mr. RANKIN. Do you want to put those in the record at this point, Mr. Thomas?

Mr. THOMAS. I think it would be a good idea to put them in the record.

Mr. RANKIN. Without objection, you may insert them, Mr. Thomas, at this point.

Mr. BUDENZ. I raise this particular issue, not merely to single him out, because I would do that with very great reluctance. The important point is that all my actions before I went to see Adamic were carried forward after conferences with either Browder or Jacob Golos, of World Tourists, who is now dead, and they had conferences in some instances with Berger-Eisler on this question. In other words, what I wish to bring in the picture are Eisler's activities in a broad sense from what I know of them.

As a matter of fact, on one occasion as to a certain part of Adamic's book on Yugoslavia that I showed to Browder prior to publication, he had to take that away and show it to Mr. Eisler together cooperatively before he gave his opinion on it.

I mentioned also the question of the Catholic Church, and I raise that because today it is a question that is of concern to every American, and its part of the tactics of Communists as I learned them. I was

one of those who were fooled into believing that in America there could be cooperation between the Communists and the Catholics.

I found that was considered undesirable from the Communist viewpoint, but beyond that I learned toward my latter days in the Communist Party from material I read in the New Times, which is now the name of the Communist International magazine, that the Communists everywhere plan to wage war on the Catholic Church as the base for obliterating all religion. Also, this policy was developed in an article to which I shall call your attention setting forth the ideas that I learned, namely, of the program to arouse the Protestants against the Catholics in this country as a means of causing confusion in the United States.

I have enough confidence in the American Protestants to know that that is not going to succeed, but I have to point to this because it is in black and white in an official article. I knew about this before I left, and pointed to it very temperately in my statement as I left. This matter was presented to me in a conference by the comrade who worked up the material for this article for the political committee. He advised me the aim was to extend the work of the Protestant magazine. That is a magazine whose name is "Protestant," but which is engaged largely in being anti-Catholic and the responsible Jewish organizations have recently condemned it, as you may know. That view of the extension of the Protestant work against Catholics was confirmed by this article of V. J. Jerome in Political Affairs in April 1946, in which he links up the Catholic Church with American imperialism, and in which he shows what he calls the great wealth of the Catholic Church and says there has been no sufficient Protestant reaction. That immediately tells the comrades to go out and pose as Protestants and arouse that reaction, for when a Communist reads an article he puts it into action. In this article the recent attack on Cardinal Spellman by the Communist councilmen in New York City was endorsed as being proper Communist tactics when it was feasible to do so. In other words, here is outlined a program which is directly opposed to the alleged outstretched-hand idea which the Communists formerly said they stood for when they needed to rally everybody, including Catholics, to the defense of the Soviet Union against the efficient German war machine. This renewed program of war upon the Catholic Church is contained in the April 1946 issue of Political Affairs as part of their tactics within the United States today.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Budenz, is it not a fact that communism is opposed to all kinds of religion?

Mr. BUDENZ. That is correct. A totalitarian regime, especially one built on the materialistic interpretation of history, cannot permit any organization of religion except as a servile tool of the all-powerful state.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Budenz, did you go to Moscow?

Mr. BUDENZ. I did not.

Mr. RANKIN. You have not been to Moscow?

Mr. BUDENZ. I did not have that experience.

Mr. RANKIN. I heard former President Hoover, and I believe he was speaking over the radio when he said there was a streamer across the gates of Moscow that read like this: "Religion Is the Opium of the People." Now, that was the Communist doctrine, was it not, even

before you went into the party, and all the time you were in the party, is that correct?

MR. BUDENZ. That was the principle, although, you see at that time they had the policy of the outstretched hand, which was the result of the Peoples' Front policy and they contended that they wanted cooperation between all religions and the Communists, or specifically the Catholics and the Communists.

However, I would like to say this to sort of bring this to a point: The fact of the matter is, those who sought collaboration, like myself as an individual, as one member of the party, did so on the basis that this outstretched-hand policy would lead to better relationship between the two groups, and that was roughly in line with the policy of the Communists at that time.

Now, it was written by Elizabeth Flynn in the Daily Worker at the time I left the party that you could have any religion you chose and remain in the Communist Party. That is not true. You cannot have any religion, except where you are in a particular religion and it serves the purpose of the party to keep you there. Even there, as Lenin pointed out, the party must fight religious ideology. The leaders of the party are not permitted to hold any religious belief. As proof of that we have the statement of Gilbert Green at the 1935 convention of the Communist International, its so-called Peoples Front convention. In that statement, representing the American Communist young peoples organization from this country, the Young Communist League, Mr. Green pointed out—I cannot now give you the exact quotes—but he pointed out that they did allow, when they came into association with religious youth, they did allow these youth to continue to go to church, but in such a way as not to interfere with "our atheistic principles." He was there explaining to the Communists that atheism was their standard, but sometimes in working with youth they had to be more lenient, and, of course, that meant that they would try to wean those youth away from religion entirely. That was Lenin's instructions years ago.

MR. RANKIN. If it would not break the continuity of your thought, it would be an accommodation to the committee at this time if you would tell just why you got out of the Communist Party. Give us that information at this time, Mr. Budenz.

MR. BUDENZ. Well, I think you can begin to see from my testimony that I was a Peoples' Front Communist. That is to say, I became a member of the Communist Party, and very briefly I would like to tell how this was, because it is just a personal experience. I became a member of the party because of the Seventh Congress of the Communist International in 1935 promising to cooperate with democratic organizations. It seemed to me then that if Hitler was destroyed that the Soviet Union would become more democratic. I did not have illusions that the Soviet Union was fully democratic, and if you will read the letter I wrote to the Daily Worker at that time I there made reference to Charles Dickens' statement on early America. It was my personal opinion that there were defects in Soviet Russia, but that they would get better. I thought after the destruction of Hitlerism the Soviet Union would become more democratic and also it would embark upon a cooperative policy of peace.

As managing editor of the Daily Worker I saw that this was not taking place. I saw that instead of becoming democratic the dictatorship was more intense, and likewise instead of embarking on a peace program there after the war they set forth on this war of nerves. There were many indications of that ahead of the Browder business. As a matter of fact, right on the eve of the Browder business, Joseph Starobin, the foreign editor of the Daily Worker wrote a very indiscreet letter to the editorial board of the Daily Worker, from whence it was snatched up and immediately traveled to the ninth floor. And in that letter he said toward the end of the San Francisco Conference, that the French comrades, who were used largely to beat the Americans, asserted that there should be more of an attack upon Stettinius by the American Communists. He added that this was "likewise the opinion of Comrade Manuelsky." This letter was very quickly taken by Stachel and it traveled to the ninth floor and disappeared. This was an instance, before Browder's deposition showed how things were going.

There were many indications from the information that came to me that the Soviet Union was to begin a policy of hostility on the other nations who had been their allies in the war. Of course this was disclosed in the Duclos article which said the Tehran pact is "only a diplomatic gesture."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Budenz, did you discover while you were in the party that practically every move had as its design the overthrow of the Government of the United States, the destruction of our form of Government and way of life, including our religious systems and our economic system?

Mr. BUDENZ. Well, there is a far-flung development of this idea. I found the Communist movement is merely a tool of the Soviet dictatorship, and in forwarding of a world Soviet dictatorship it means the destruction of the present Government of the United States, most certainly.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, they also want to effect the overthrow of our economic system, what they call the capitalistic system, which simply means the right to own property, does it not? I want to read you one passage here and see if this is the Communist doctrine, as you understand it, because the Communist Party wrote this:

Among the first actions of the Soviet Government would be a decree recognizing the confiscation of the large land ownerships. Where this has taken place, or authorizing such confiscation if it has not yet taken place, converting all privately owned land into the property of the whole people without compensation, and the confiscation of all livestock and implements of the large land-owners for the use of the people.

In other words, in addition to outlawing religion and wiping out our form of government, they would wipe out our entire economic system, as I understand it.

Mr. BUDENZ. Yes; that is correct, except that I would not like to say just "Yes" there. I would like to discuss it much more at length, but not now.

Mr. THOMAS. I would like to see Mr. Budenz continue, or we will never get through with Mr. Budenz.

Mr. RANKIN. All right; go ahead.

Mr. BUDENZ. In other words, just to say categorically "Yes" or "No" does not satisfy me as the answer I should make, although it might take me quite a length of time to go into this question, Congressman.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. BUDENZ. Well, I believe this begins to sum up what I have to present to the committee. There is no doubt that there are a number of other important things that I could bring to your attention. As a matter of fact, in regard to the articles of Berger in the Communist magazine, I will file those with the committee and be satisfied with that for the time being. It had been my intention to go into them more deeply, but I think that is unnecessary at this time. I picked out three which explain the outstanding position of Berger-Eisler, and without wishing to burden the time of the committee, I present those to you.

It is very evident that he was not and is not a refugee in the ordinary sense of the word. It is clear here that he occupies an important position in the Communist Party and Communist action because otherwise he would not so act, and anyone who wrote articles of this character, the article which sat down on Foster, and who wrote that article with Browder and particularly in regard to the dissolution of the Communist International was not someone just picked up incidentally and told to do this.

Now, that is a point that I want to emphasize very much.

As to my own personal contacts with Mr. Berger they are limited to two occasions. I was never formally introduced to him, except of course in the case of Edwards in 1935.

I saw him very briefly at the funeral of Jacob Golos in late 1943, and at that time I was supposed to be introduced to him. But the people present there disappeared so quickly and there was an interruption by several people speaking to me so that this did not take place, although I was also told then that I knew him from the past. This was by Mr. Stachel. At the time of the meeting of the enlarged national committee, the exact date of which I will supply later in a memorandum to the committee, but it was in 1943 also, I saw Mr. Berger-Eisler waiting for Mr. Browder across the street from the national committee meeting place. Mr. Browder and I, as a matter of fact, went to the national committee together, and Mr. Browder told me that he had to be excused because he had to have a few minutes before the meeting with Hans Berger, the international man.

Mr. RANKIN. That is, Mr. Eisler?

Mr. BUDENZ. Yes; and Browder went across the street and Mr. Eisler was waiting for him and they sat in the automobile and discussed things for 10 minutes. We waited for Browder, his attendant, Harold Smith, and I, and we then went into the hall together. The exact date of that I will give to the committee in a memorandum, but it was sometime in 1943, according to my remembrance, but the existence of Berger-Eisler as the power behind the throne was very evident, and I have given you only some few examples.

There is one instance more that I wanted to give, and it arises out of this Runag incident. I have said that Berger was particularly insistent upon our bringing forward that the Soviet Russian Govern-

ment be pictured as "democratic." Of course this insistence centered also around the second front and the necessity for pushing argument on the second front in the United States. Later on, because the Russians and such agencies could not reach us with their subsidized news and directives, we did not have enough material and he insisted that we use the Soviet Embassy bulletins in this matter, and this was reinforced later by Stachel, who was clearly under pressure from Berger on these questions.

As a matter of fact, it was always easy to tell after one of the leading comrades had been in touch with someone like Berger. They were very much excited, and very bureaucratic, and very eager to put something through, even though they could not fully explain it themselves. I mention this use of those Soviet Embassy bulletins because we had a long period there where we could not get in touch with Moscow on full information through articles. It is out of the scientific ideologic language of such articles that every trained Communist knows what to do. You have to know that in an editorial position in order to carry forward with the assistance of the political representative of the political committee and also with the information that came from Mr. Eisler. This was a broad field, and a big gap was created by lack of Runag and other like information and news that came here from the Soviet capital. Of course, we did have some cables from Moscow. John Gibbons, who is Reuters correspondent there, cabled over sometimes. He was also correspondent for the London Daily Worker, but his cables were not considered to be enlightening enough. They did not contain sufficient directives. You must understand that the Communist Party has a policy line. That is obtained partly through these contacts and partly from the articles that appear in Pravda, Izvestia, and the rest of the Soviet press.

If there is anything that would give you a picture of a Communist leader it is his feverish search every day of what Pravda or Izvestia says to make sure he has got the proper sensitivity regarding the line that must be followed for that day or for that period. If there are some lapses, it is largely due to difficulties of communication or the time element. The Daily Worker once attacked Badoglio as a Fascist in a leading editorial and that very day a cable came over saying that the Soviet Government had recognized him as a stabilizing influence. But the issue of the paper got out ahead of this cable. There was a quick change, though, to make Badoglio appear in the light of the articles which the press ran and the statements Moscow made. So it was one of those little lapses which are merely lapses of time and place which are due to difficulties of transmission, but wherever possible Pravda and Izvestia are read every day to make sure that the Daily Worker is following what they say in the sense of translating it into the lingo of this country. The New Times is now the name of the Communist International magazine, which formerly went through the transition from the Communist International magazine to World Survey, and then to War and the Working Class, and it is now the New Times, and that is watched very carefully and studied very carefully by all those who want to set the policy and want to know what policy is. The only difficulty is the English translation comes to America rather late for current events, and therefore articles in Pravda and Izvestia have a larger immediate meaning. In addition, there had been this Runag and the Intercontinent News, which

broke down, a difficulty which was remedied only in part, however, by the use of the Soviet Embassy bulletins.

Counsel has asked me to clarify the ownership, management, and control of the Daily Worker.

Of course, while I was president of the corporation it was in a peculiar position. It was the Freedom of the Press Co., Inc., which was created during the Hitler-Stalin pact. That was in order to defend the Daily Worker at all costs from any legal attack.

The Freedom of the Press Co., Inc., was put under the ownership of three gentlewomen who were very nice ladies, and who knew nothing at all about what was happening.

As a matter of fact, they were pure figureheads in even that sense. They met with me once every 4 or 6 months just for half an hour, and we went over our reports telling them in general what was happening, and that was the end of that.

They generally were invited to all big mass meetings and were given a seat near the front. But they did not know at all what was actually happening. To make the paper move, I was named as president and Ben Davis and the other officer rotated. Davis was secretary and then vice president, and Howard Boldt was secretary and afterwards vice president.

When this was decided upon, Browder saw me and told me it was going to take place in advance, and said one reason it was taking place was due to the fact that first of all I had shown that I had no technical difficulties, and secondly he was sure by this process of putting such people in charge the Daily Worker would be defended from any legal attack during the Hitler-Stalin period.

That was the sole reason for having this corporation in this form.

As a matter of fact, in the articles creating this corporation it was stated—I do not know the exact wording any more, but to safeguard it under the alleged ownership by these gentlewomen, it was even stated it would always follow the viewpoint of the Communist Party. That was inserted in the articles of incorporation. So that in this manner it continued to be, and, of course, it was always an organ of the Communist Party.

That was the situation during the time I was there.

Mr. RANKIN. The Communist Party, Mr. Budenz, is nothing but a fifth column in this country; is it a fifth column for communism in Europe?

Mr. BUDENZ. Well, I have stated its character. It is a puppet fifth column of the Soviet dictatorship.

Mr. RANKIN. It works through various what you and I call Communist-front organizations, does it not?

Mr. BUDENZ. Very frequently, yes.

I have only given the beginning of the story, but this is very important insofar as I could give it.

Mr. RANKIN. You might discuss those Communist-front organizations.

Mr. BUDENZ. I would like to ask the committee today to excuse me from that, Congressman. I would like to be much more precise in discussing it than I could at this time.

Mr. RANKIN. You are going to discuss that at a later date?

Mr. BUDENZ. Yes; I am going to discuss that at a later date. I would like to explain here that I am dealing here with a conspiracy, and I want that understood.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. BUDENZ. A conspiracy with which you have to be very precise in your definitions. Otherwise we will have another attempt to put down the little iron curtain on the ground that a person's credibility is not of any value.

I think it is time to stop that in America. I think it is time that Americans should be able to tell the truth about all organizations such as this fifth column of Soviet Russia, the truth in temperate language. But in order to do that I am impressed, gentlemen, with the fact that this information must be precise and must be as accurate as you can make it for two reasons; first, because you want to have credibility and the truth in what is uttered, and, secondly, because at the same time you want to establish and make clear the different degrees by which people are enmeshed in this net of fronts, and we cannot do that without considering the matter carefully.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to say, Mr. Budenz, that we are going to give you all the time you want if it takes from now until Christmas or from new until this time next year because that is what the American people want, the facts and the real truth.

Mr. THOMAS. This conspiracy that you refer to, as I understand it, is the most important point of your statement today. It is not clear to me, however, who are the participants in this conspiracy. Just very briefly who participates in this conspiracy?

Mr. BUDENZ. Well, I have indicated already that the conspiracy is the underground apparatus of the Communist movement, linked up with the open Communist Party here, and these two agencies have expanded themselves into the front organizations and other organizations which they penetrate. However, the conspiracy itself is directed by the Soviet Union through this underground apparatus, and is reflected in the Communist Party in its policies in the United States.

Mr. THOMAS. All right, this conspiracy is made up by participants in the conspiracy—

Mr. BUDENZ (interposing). Correct; it is headed by the—

Mr. THOMAS (interposing). It is headed by the Communist Party in the United States?

Mr. BUDENZ. Correct.

Mr. THOMAS. And Communist-front organizations in the United States?

Mr. BUDENZ. As creations of this conspiracy, that is right. Some of the participants in the latter groups have knowledge of what they are doing to a greater or less degree, you understand.

Mr. THOMAS. All right, now, those are the participants. Now, what is the conspiracy?

Mr. BUDENZ. Mr. Molotoff has stated that very well.

Mr. THOMAS. Never mind Mr. Molotoff; let Mr. Budenz state it.

Mr. BUDENZ. I am drawing it out of the experience I have learned.

Mr. THOMAS. All right.

Mr. BUDENZ. They are trying to establish world dictatorship under the control of the Kremlin dictatorship.

Mr. THOMAS. All right, that is a good answer.

Mr. BUDENZ. That is it.

Mr. RANKIN. In other words, they are trying to spread communism throughout the world.

Mr. BUDENZ. Not only communism, but communism under the specific direction of the Kremlin dictatorship.

Mr. MUNDT. I think the distinction you are trying to make, Mr. Budenz, is that what they actually have in Russia is not the communism of Marx and Engles, but a dictatorship and communism under which people are denied a great many things under the concepts of communism?

Mr. BUDENZ. The point of the matter is the reality has certainly not lived up to expectations. The promised withering away of the state is certainly a long way off and Stalin has practically declared the idea buried in the Soviet Union, but that is a longer-time question.

Mr. MUNDT. I was just mentioning that.

Mr. BUDENZ. What I would like to state is we have here a totalitarian regime committed to the form of Soviet dictatorship existing in Russia and seeking to expand that dictatorship to world domination including, of course, all countries under this domination.

Mr. THOMAS. If this conspiracy exists, and the purpose of it is to put us all under the dictatorship of the proletariat; why does not the Department of Justice of the United States take some action?

Mr. BUDENZ. Well, that, of course, I do not know fully. As a matter of fact, this dictatorship of the proletariat, of course, is the dictatorship—let us understand—of Stalin, Molotov, et al, because Stalin has been proclaimed the leader, the teacher, and guide. We must understand that to get the full conception of this, it seems to me. Why does not the Department of Justice do something? That I really do not know. There are certain reasons, of course. First, Americans correctly are very jealous of what we call civil rights, and a conspiracy of this character takes advantage of democracy by using democratic institutions to destroy democracy. Therefore, our laws very frequently are not designed to meet conspiracies of this character. That is one thing.

Mr. THOMAS. Right at that point, and in this connection, on October 7 of this year I wrote a letter to Attorney General Clark calling upon him to crack down on this Moscow-directed fifth column operating in the United States. I submitted to the Attorney General five specific violations of the Federal statutes. Among these violations was the Voray Act which required that every organization, subject to foreign control, which engaged in political activities, shall be required to register with the Attorney General. Do you not consider the Communist Party at the present time to be in violation of that act?

Mr. BUDENZ. From my experience, I do.

Mr. THOMAS. All right. I also called the Attorney General's attention to the McCormick Registration act, which requires that every person who is now an agent of a foreign government shall be registered with the Secretary of State.

I would like to know which officials and members of the Communist Party you consider to fall under the provisions of this act.

Mr. BUDENZ. Certainly all the leading officers of the Communist Party. The record shows they just follow what Moscow wants them to do. The record is very clear.

Mr. THOMAS. All right. Was not the Freedom of the Press Co., Inc., a dummy corporation set up just to get around this McCormick Act?

Mr. BUDENZ. Yes; in a large measure it was.

Mr. THOMAS. That is right.

On this matter of the Daily Worker, I would like to know if any fraud or misrepresentation was perpetrated in securing second-class mailing privileges from the Post Office Department?

Mr. BUDENZ. That I do not know. After consideration, I might recall it, but I do not recall anything right now.

Mr. THOMAS. If the Communist Party and the Freedom of the Press, Inc., and some of these Communist leaders have all violated the specific statutes of the Government, can you see any reason why the Attorney General should not take action against them?

Mr. BUDENZ. Well, I think that is self-evident.

Mr. THOMAS. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. I am going to answer your question. There are too many Reds and fellow travelers that have crept into the Department of Justice, and we are going to need to clean house and fumigate and get the Department of Justice back on the beam.

Mr. LANDIS. Are you familiar with anyone who has advised the Political Action Committee, especially regarding the election of 1944?

Mr. BUDENZ. If you will permit, I would like to reserve all these questions until later so that I can answer them in a very precise manner. There is no doubt that the Communists were very active in PAC, in connection with it.

Regarding all these political activity questions, because I want to be very precise and accurate, I would like to refrain from discussing those today, if the committee will permit.

Mr. LANDIS. Perhaps you could answer this regarding Communist policy. Is it not a fact that under communism the state is the supreme master over the life of its citizens?

Mr. BUDENZ. It most decidedly is because it has more than control. It has absolute power over life and livelihood. As a matter of fact, where is the security of the Soviet system, the very alleged basis of the system? I cannot see it, because of the fact that your livelihood is at the mercy of the state and the state is actually four or five men in control of the Kremlin.

When those writers in the Soviet Union that I spoke of a moment ago were declared to have bourgeois ideas, which must of course have meant western democratic ideas, do we not know from past experience that they lost not only their jobs but the source of all livelihood? When 50 percent of the Communist Party officials themselves in the Ukraine, according to the reports, were deposed from their posts because they could not collect the grain fast enough from the peasants, they likewise may have faced, unless they conformed, the loss of their livelihood, so, the individual's livelihood, which is an important part of his make-up, is dependent upon the all-powerful state, which is dependent upon the will of three or four all-powerful men.

Mr. LANDIS. I understand that you used to be a lawyer, and do you not understand that the trade-unions are agents of the state in Russia?

Mr. BUDENZ. They are.

Mr. LANDIS. These unions in Russia are helpless to protect labor against exploitation.

Mr. BUDENZ. They have admitted that themselves. We have recently had articles in TRUD, the Soviet trade-union magazine, which was quoted by Drew Middleton in the New York Times magazine section recently, in which they pointed out several cases, but one re-

mains in my mind specifically of a mining operation where the workers were not paid for weeks and months. I cannot remember whether it was 6 weeks or 6 months. We can see clearly, though, that there was not any talk about strikes in that case. If they had thought of striking, they would not dare do it. The secret police are everywhere, in their unions, and you can go to Siberia, as a matter of fact, for talking along that line. The point of the matter is I want to show that the trade-unions were not able, except by being prodded, to protect these people. They are abject agents of the autocratic state.

Mr. LANDIS. The American labor should know about that.

Mr. BUDENZ. They certainly should.

Mr. LANDIS. Many of them are misinformed.

Mr. BUDENZ. There is more to this than that, but today I am not prepared to bring it forward. There is very much more than this.

Mr. LANDIS. I suppose that you are familiar with the 1945 shipping strike. That was the strike that prevented the bringing of some American boys back from overseas. I wonder if that would be an example of political sabotage.

Mr. BUDENZ. I would prefer to take up all these things all at once at some other time, if you do not mind, so that I can be exact and accurate.

Mr. THOMAS. You mentioned the Soviet secret police in your statement this morning, and you said in your statement that the Soviet secret police were here. What did you mean by that?

Mr. BUDENZ. I meant representatives of the so-called NKVD. I will only say now that I know they were here because I dealt with them for 2 years and slightly more, not in espionage but in another operation, and I must inform the committee of that in executive session.

Mr. THOMAS. In regard to that, do you still believe that they are here now?

Mr. BUDENZ. It would be a surprise if they were not.

Mr. MUNDT. Professor Budenz, I wonder if you are at all familiar with any of the work or activities of the so-called National Council of American Soviet Friendship, Inc.

Mr. BUDENZ. May I make a statement, first?

Regarding this question of the Soviet police, Mr. Thomas, I am prepared to discuss that publicly, but with regard to some of these other questions, I want to answer them very carefully so that I can present those matters to the committee in the proper light. As a matter of fact, I want to say that I do know of my own knowledge that Soviet secret police were in America; that they were here for a number of months and that I had contact with them as an assignment from the party, meeting them over and over in different restaurants in New York.

Mr. THOMAS. That was in what year?

Mr. BUDENZ. 1936 and 1937, so far as I recall; and part of 1938, too.

Mr. THOMAS. What kind of visas did they have?

Mr. BUDENZ. That I do not know.

Mr. THOMAS. But you are of the opinion that they are here now also?

Mr. BUDENZ. I certainly am.

Mr. MUNDT. I wonder if you are familiar at all with the work or activities of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship,

Inc., which publishes a biweekly paper called *The Reporter*, which our studies have indicated has the same fidelity to the Communist line that the *Daily Worker* has?

Mr. RANKIN. Before you answer that, there is a question that I would like to ask him regarding what he was testifying to a while ago. As I understand you, then, and I would like to get this clear; every workingman in Russia, or in any Communist country, is the slave of the state? Every individual is the slave of the state, and the state is operated by a very small portion of the population; we will say 1 percent of the population?

Mr. BUDENZ. That is correct. By the way, I have not been to Soviet Russia. I am one of those people who do not have the benefit of education for foreign service at the Marx-Lenin Institute in Moscow, although most of the Communist leaders have. It is surprising how restricted is the leadership in the Communist Party, actually. Most of the leadership have been educated in the institute in Moscow, which is similar to the schools they had in Germany, or Hitler had, to train people in foreign work. I am an American by birth and experience, and have never been outside of the United States, physically, except brief visits to Canada.

As a matter of fact, the conditions inside the Communist Party of the United States without police power partly show you what exists in the Soviet Union with their all-seeing police power.

Mr. RANKIN. In a certain district in New York, if they had the benefit of the police, they would have made the election unanimous?

Mr. BUDENZ. They make it over there pretty nearly unanimous.

May I also ask to be relieved of answering the question propounded by Mr. Mundt.

Regarding these front organizations, I will volunteer, since the committee presses, to bring this to the attention of the committee in an organized form in whatever way you see fit, either by another appearance or by a written report under affidavit.

There are certain variations of participation of these various organizations, and I want to be absolutely accurate in designating them.

Mr. RANKIN. You are speaking of the so-called Communist front organizations?

Mr. BUDENZ. Yes; I am.

Mr. RANKIN. I would prefer you make another appearance, and be prepared to go into this question thoroughly. I am speaking for myself.

Mr. BUDENZ. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. MUNDT. As a matter of general policy, and from your observations because of your connection with the Communist Party, were special efforts made by the party leadership to make contacts with the schools and children in schools and colleges to advance the Communist line?

Mr. BUDENZ. Well, they try to make advances to every group in every possible way. It is well recognized, and Communist discussion has shown so, that the Communist movement of itself is not going to get anywhere in America. That was the premise of Browder's argument, but on the other side we find James Allen having that argument for another reason. America is a hopeless capitalistic country, he contended. That does not mean that the Communists are

going to quit being active here; it means that their tactics have to change. However, they, therefore, try through all sorts of fellow-traveling organizations and groups to enter into every phase of American life—I mean from Hollywood to Hell Gate—every phase of American life they try to enter into and penetrate, and do it not under Communist guise, but under Communist disguise; that is to say, making themselves out as liberals or as trade-unionists, or whatever the case may be, and then they penetrate the organization that they wish to penetrate.

Mr. MUNDT. I am not trying to pin you down on details until we come to that part of the testimony. You know, as a matter of personal knowledge that one of the special devices that the Communists use is an effort to work through schools and colleges and the children thereof, either directly or through a friend organization.

Mr. BUDENZ. That is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. You talked this morning about the dissolution of the Third International and how that was actually not achieved. Is the Third International synonymous with the word "Comintern"?

Mr. BUDENZ. Comintern is an abbreviation for the Communist International. So is CI.

Mr. MUNDT. I received a letter about a month ago from Victor Kervchanko, about whom you probably know, and I had asked him some questions about this dissolution of the Comintern, and he said, as you have said, that it was simply a device for deceiving outside parties. He listed several names, one of which I think you used today. I am not too familiar with these Russian terms, but he said to prove the point, some of the men participating in the dissolution were Dimtriff, of Bulgaria, who is a puppet dictator of the country of Bulgaria, and Thorez, whom you also mentioned today, is in France.

I wonder if your observations and your knowledge would tend to give you information verifying what he said to me in that letter along that line.

Mr. BUDENZ. That is the substance of the testimony today, that is, that first of all the Communist organization in the United States—not just casually but virtually 100 percent—serves the will of Moscow at the particular moment.

Mr. MUNDT. Do you limit that to the Communist organization in the United States, or would you say the Communist organization in any country, or outside of Russia?

Mr. BUDENZ. In any country.

Mr. ADAMSON. I would like to ask you if you know anything about a Soviet agent named Arkady Soberlov.

Mr. BUDENZ. No, not by that name. He may have many other names, of course.

Mr. ADAMSON. That is the only name that I happen to have at the moment.

Mr. LANDIS. I have in mind when Mr. Browder was put out of office, temporarily at least, and they changed their line. It looks like during the war they had the Tehran line everywhere so that they could get materials from us. The Communist line, it seemed, was to get the materials produced in the United States to win the war.

Mr. BUDENZ. That is right.

Mr. LANDIS. And after the war ended, why, then they changed the line and the Duclos article came out in France, and that expressed an opinion opposite to the opinion expressed by Mr. Browder.

Mr. BUDENZ. Well, Browder was following the line all right. That was the line for the war, the Tehran line. Many Communists hardly knew what they meant by it, they sort of chanted "Tehran, Tehran." The Tehran line was the line of "generations of peace" pledged by Stalin, Churchill, and Roosevelt, at Tehran, which Duclos says is "only a diplomatic gesture." The point of the matter is Browder had been faithfully carrying out the line, but it changed, and one way that Moscow could show that it has changed thoroughly was by demoting Browder. He was supposed to take his medicine. He has been rewarded by being made the representative of the Soviet book trusts in this country.

His case is something like another example, up in Canada. The Communist Party has supposedly disciplined Sam Carr for disappearing from the Canadian hearings regarding espionage. But they are the very ones who have helped to hide him. A Communist is supposed to put not only his intellect but his reputation on the altar of devotion to Stalin. Those are no exaggerated words. You can read the resolution of 1935, and it is Stalin who is the source of life and leadership and teaching to the Communists of the United States. The resolution of the Seventh Congress in 1935 is very clear on that point.

Mr. LANDIS. I would like to ask a question on religion. I understand that it is grudgingly tolerated in Russia and controlled by the state.

Mr. BUDENZ. Well, it is amazing what you can learn by being editor of a Communist newspaper here without being in Soviet Russia, because you have to be advised of Soviet plans and policies. We were advised that—sure, they have freedom of religion over there, but it is easy to charge \$100 or \$150 a month for electricity for a Mass. There are hundreds of ways that you can prevent this religious worship without interfering openly with religious worship. That was what was told me among other things. As a result, the Orthodox Church has become more of a tool of the state than it was in the days of the czars. Nobody pays any attention to the Soviet persecution of the Catholic Uniats. The Catholic Uniats at the point of machine guns are being sent to Siberia and elsewhere for trying to stay out of the Orthodox Church, the state church of Russia.

I think that it is a shame, a disgrace, that more of these facts have not been publicized—the ways that the Catholics are being persecuted by the Soviet in the newly dominated territories, especially.

This last war was supposed to be the war for the "four freedoms." They are much mutilated by now. That is an indication of what has happened, the terror against the Catholics. There may be, incidentally, more, Mr. Landis, but I just know that.

Mr. RANKIN. As I said, the policy of the Communist regime toward religion was expressed on that streamer that President Hoover told us was across the gates of Moscow, that religion is the opiate of the people.

You spoke about the attacks on the capitalistic system. We people throughout the country, when we speak of capitalism, think of rich people. What they mean by the capitalistic system is the right to own private property; is not that right?

Mr. BUDENZ. That is what it develops into.

Mr. RANKIN. In other words, that is what they say in this article that I read to you a while ago, adopted by the Communist Party of the United States—that they would take over not only all of the factories and railroads and mines, but they would take over all the stores, all of the houses, all filling stations, and all lands and make every individual the slave of the state. Is that right?

Mr. BUDENZ. The livelihood of every individual under the totalitarian Soviet dictatorship is dependent upon the state, and the state is dependent upon two or three individuals in the Kremlin.

Mr. RANKIN. And the state can tell him when and where he shall work; is that correct?

Mr. BUDENZ. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. And when and where he shall not work?

Mr. BUDENZ. Correct.

Mr. RANKIN. They can remove him from his job and starve him to death, if they want to.

Mr. BUDENZ. That is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. Regarding these overrun countries, are you familiar with the rape of innocent women, the murder of innocent men, the plunder of the peasants, and the robbery of the helpless people in those areas by the Communist regime?

Mr. BUDENZ. I know that Europe is in a much worse condition than it was after World War I and that the major bad actors in this regime have been the Red Army and those connected with it.

Mr. RANKIN. I think that you have answered the question pretty well. You speak of communism and fascism. What is the difference? Is one high popalorum and the other low pophigrum?

Mr. BUDENZ. Out of my experience I find that they have very much the same result. They are both totalitarian regimes, the all-powerful state becoming a divinity in itself whereby you have the god-man Stalin, unable to make a mistake, being the reservoir of all goodness to the Soviet people, and the same thing over in Germany, the god-man Hitler, the Fuehrer. The same principles follow exactly. Formerly I tried to distinguish between the two; it can't be done. They are the same. Why should we not admit it? They produce the same results exactly. The rule is in the hands of two or three people, and as I have shown, the so-called leaders elsewhere have surrendered their whole intellectual capacity to these dictators. They have only to follow what they are told to do, or they are unhorsed from their positions, and they are, therefore, mere echoes. They have ceased to think. I mean that they have ceased to think when it comes to any contradiction to the leaders of the Soviet or Hitlerite state, as the case may be.

The result of this is that you do not argue to a conclusion, you argue from a conclusion. As a matter of fact, what does every Communist leader do? I know that process very well. Would anyone ask at any time: Is this decision of Moscow right or wrong? Would you every say anything like that? No! You say, "How comes this to be such a wonderful decision?" And you proceed with the casuistry that only comes from training to prove that it, Soviet-created view or decision, is the most splendid thing that could happen for America and for humanity and everybody else at this particular time. It is the will of Stalin as given from Moscow, from Pravada, the New Times, and elsewhere, and that makes it perfect. That is a

comfortable position because you have your conclusions outlined for you, but it is a destruction of the intellect. This whole business which is supposed to be founded on a Marxist-Leninist science, which claims that it elevates the intellect to a scientific capacity, in reality destroys the intellect completely. We see this in the case of William Z. Foster, and if you will read his article of September 1945 in Political Affairs, you will see that he says that he feared expulsion from the party. He said, "We have not had democracy or democratic centralism here"—that is the phrase by which they deceive themselves—"we have had only centralism." When he got into the saddle would you not think that Mr. Foster would begin to introduce the democratic centralism he talks about? He did just the opposite.

I introduced a resolution in that national committee session of June 1945, even though I already saw the bankruptcy of the Communist movement, declaring for democratic procedure, for the creation of a party commission to develop democratic action in the party. The whole idea that I raised was suppressed. The last thing they wanted was real democratic discussion in the organization, because how can you have democratic discussion if you wish to hand out a dictated line to people! They must accept it, whether they will or not. When Foster got to be leader—and this is the point that I want to make—did he end expulsions? Why, they have just expelled Ruth McKinney for accusing Foster of Browderism. I am speaking now of Ruth McKinney, the author of *My Sister Eileen*. They expelled the writer Vern Smith and Bill Dunn, too. They expelled them and a number of others for accusing Foster of Browderism.

The point of the matter is that no one can have any opinion that is independent of Moscow, even in one iota. That is the case, whether Browder or Foster is the puppet leader. That is what I wanted to indicate.

Mr. LANDIS. How do you account for the fact that the intellectuals in America can follow this party line?

Mr. BUDENZ. Because it gives them a kind of certainty. They see certain weaknesses in our present system, with all of its merit, and that is, for instance, the constant return of the business cycle and other things of that character. They start out with the idea of remedying that condition, and they get enmeshed into the whole system of this conspiratorial and lying character.

Secondly, I would like to say at this point that the intellectuals, and particularly the so-called liberals, are of course meat for the Communists. The Communists, as I have said in quotation marks, called them "soft-headed and soft-hearted liberals," and to some extent that is a correct designation. They rush out to defend the Communist line, without any responsibilities on their part. It is a very comfortable position to be in, by the way. You do not have any of the responsibilities of the Communist leadership, and on the other hand you have the satisfaction of acting very progressively, as they call it, because the Communists keep harping on progressive as they do opponents Fascist. The liberals are the first line of defense for the Communists. When I say liberals, I want to be thoroughly understood. I mean by liberals those who ally themselves with the Communist cause. There are also liberals who are opposed to Communists. These pro-Communist people, among whom the intellectuals are very much represented, first

start out with good will toward the world with the idea of reforming it, and then before you know it you find that they represent a certain viewpoint; they are parroting every current Communist phrase and let me tell you from my own experience, Congressmen, it is the hardest thing in the world to admit that you are wrong. I know that from my own hesitancy for 2 years to admit that I was wrong and to hope that things would turn out different from what they were in fact. Therefore, the intellectually proud liberals are enmeshed in this thing.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, if we may digress from the discussion of Henry Wallace for a minute, I want to give a little documentary evidence from a high source, that is, if we could remove the fog which confuses so much thinking among the Americans, that there is a great distinction between fascism and communism, and they are sort of natural enemies—

Mr. BUDENZ. Fundamentally, there is no distinction.

Mr. MUNDT. They are the same, and if we could get the average American to realize that, we could focus our attack on all of these "isms" and drive them out of public life and out of the position of importance.

I want to read one paragraph supporting exactly what I have said, from what I consider one of the best public addresses given in America in the last quarter of a century. I am going to read from a speech that J. Edgar Hoover made on September 30 before the National Convention of the American Legion in San Francisco, Calif., bearing on this point that you have made.

He said :

We of this generation have faced two great menaces in America, fascism and communism. Both are materialistic; both are totalitarian; both are antireligious; both are degrading and inhuman. In fact, they differ little except in this: Communism has spread fascism and fascism spawns communism. Both are the antithesis of American belief in liberty and freedom.

From your experience as the leader in one of those movements, to wit, communism, would you say that your experience gives merit to that particular point?

Mr. BUDENZ. I think Mr. Hoover is very well informed.

Mr. RANKIN. One fellow stated that communism and fascism were both symptoms of the same disease; that one of them is the fever and the other the chill to dying civilization.

Mr. THOMAS. Before we get into the chills and fever I would like this article to be part of the record.

Mr. RANKIN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THOMAS. You mentioned Eugene Dennis. Did you say that he was in technical difficulty?

Mr. BUDENZ. Well, I raised that point with very great reluctance because he expressed it in a half-way manner, but he gave that statement that he was in technical difficulty.

Mr. THOMAS. That is Eugene Dennis?

Mr. BUDENZ. Eugene Dennis said that.

Mr. THOMAS. And by technical difficulty did you mean that it had something to do with a passport?

Mr. BUDENZ. It had something to do with a false passport or some equivalent "technical difficulty" activity, which disturbed him.

Mr. THOMAS. How long ago was that?

Mr. BUDENZ. Well, as I say, he raised that with me twice. Once was before he went underground; the other time when he emerged from the underground, so that would be—well, that would be around 1940, first, and then later, in 1942.

Mr. THOMAS. Did he ever get out of those difficulties?

Mr. BUDENZ. That I do not know.

Mr. THOMAS. Was any action taken against Eugene Dennis that you know of by the Government?

Mr. BUDENZ. Not that I know of.

Mr. ADAMSON. I would like to ask another question.

You have described how these various operatives go underground for periods of time. Do you know where the money comes from to support these gentlemen while they are secretly parading around as tired businessmen?

Mr. BUDENZ. That is a pretty difficult problem. It seems as though there are as many money sources if not more than there are activities.

Mr. THOMAS. The reason I brought out the matter of Eugene Dennis now was that under the old committee we had a witness come before us and tell us that one Earl Browder had been in technical difficulty and as a result of that testimony the Government did take action; Browder, Earl Browder, was sent to jail. Now I would like to know whether the Government is going to do anything in regard to Eugene Dennis.

Mr. BUDENZ. I have not seen it discussed.

Mr. THOMAS. I think, Mr. Adamson, you ought to get in touch with the Department of Justice to find out what they have done about Eugene Dennis.

Mr. ADAMSON. I shall do that, Mr. Thomas.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Budenz, you spoke a while ago of some Red professors that have been placed in key positions in our educational institutions. Are you in position to go into that at this time or would you rather reserve that for a future date?

Mr. BUDENZ. I would rather reserve this business of the front activities to a future date.

Mr. RANKIN. That will be satisfactory. I want to say to you when that time comes that there are so many of these angles: that is one of them. And, I would like you to discuss the school of communism that some of these Red professors have been going to in Russia.

Also, we want to go into the question of Communist influence infiltrating into the moving-picture industry, the radio, and the press of the country as well as these Communist-front organizations as they are commonly known, because this committee is dedicated to going the full length to protect this Government against subversive activities.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, may I also add that when the witness returns, that the date the committee will fix before you adjourn here today, I would also hope that he will be able to give us something in connection with the activities here in the Russian churches. We have received many letters and many stories concerning the attempted organization or the coming in of the old Orthodox Russian churches in this country by representatives from Moscow.

Mr. RANKIN. We would like to have you go into the whole picture, Mr. Budenz.

Mr. BUDENZ. You can understand that I will do the best I can. Of course my information on some questions will be limited. On others it will be much more extensive. On many of the questions you have asked me today I can throw a lot of light; on others I will bring data before you, giving you some idea of the front organizations on which I can throw some light. But I want to be in this position: I want to bring the information to you very carefully and specifically and, so far as I can, I shall do so.

There is one other caution that I want to give in testimony of this kind, and that is to repeat that we are dealing with conspiracy, which very frequently does not let the left hand know what the right hand is doing. But of course some things are specific, based upon their having become in full force and effect, and undeniable, and that is another reason why I wish to be as specific as I can.

Mr. LANDIS. I wonder if you are familiar with some Federal workers? I understand from what I have heard some of the Federal workers, that is, in some of the departments, such as the State Department, have been in the Communist Party and they have come out and opposed some of the policies that have been presented, and their opposition may have resulted in some changes in the policies.

Mr. BUDENZ. That I will also discuss with you, if you please, later.

Mr. MUNDT. I would like to ask a question there concerning how carefully have you checked into the passport of and also the citizenship status of this Hans Berger?

Mr. RANKIN. If you do not mind, Mr. Mundt, we will discuss that in executive session. Would that be all right?

Mr. MUNDT. I do not see any objection to doing it now.

Mr. ADAMSON. I understand that he is here on what might be termed a transit visa, without going into the technicalities that might portray communications from the Department of State. He has no business to be here now.

Mr. MUNDT. What I was getting at principally was this, and you can answer it in open session: I want to be sure that he remains here and that we have an opportunity to document this whole matter and he must not get out before we have that opportunity.

Mr. ADAMSON. Yes; I will take the necessary steps to see to that.

Mr. RANKIN. He is under subpoena?

Mr. ADAMSON. He is under subpoena now.

Mr. MUNDT. And you can assure us that he will be here.

Mr. ADAMSON. I will take that precaution.

Mr. RANKIN. The committee will go into executive session. There are some things we want to discuss among ourselves.

(Whereupon the committee proceeded to the consideration of business in executive session; after which it adjourned subject to call of the chairman.)

EXHIBIT B

TWENTY-FIVE YEARS OF SOVIET POWER

(By Earl Browder)

This twenty-fifth anniversary of the establishment of Soviet power is witness to the most profound change of the attitude of the people of the United States as a whole toward the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and its great leaders. For the first time there is almost universal understanding of the Soviet Union as a stage in the rise of mankind to higher civilization. There is a high and

rising evaluation of the Soviet Union as the most powerful friend and ally of the United States. And there is love for and gratitude toward the Soviet Union as the power which has so far saved this country and world democracy from destruction by the Axis aggressors.

Nothing in modern history has so profoundly stirred the American masses as the heroic defense of Stalingrad. Americans know their own fate is being decided in that battle. Americans are ashamed that the full force of our own country has not yet been thrown into the scale through the opening of the western front in Europe. For the great mass of Americans now understand full well that they can emerge from this war a free people only if they fight this war as a part of the United Nations, side by side with the Soviet Union, in full partnership, unitedly sharing its costs and burdens in full as they will jointly share the fruits of victory.

There are still some reactionary cliques in America which cling to their old dreams of helping to destroy the Soviet Union and making partnership with Hitler in dividing up the world. They are not large in numbers, but they are powerful. They are the most bitter opponents of the second front and the advocates of a negotiated "peace" with Hitler. They still dominate much of the American newspaper world. They represent some of the most powerful industrial monopolists in America. Their influence holds back the immense potential power of the United States, and prevents it from being thrown into full action to smash Hitlerism now. But these native American Fascists are rapidly losing their power over the Nation, and have already lost their control over the minds of the people.

The American people and Government are committed to alliance with the Soviet Union for this war and for the postwar period. American patriots will not tolerate in public life any expression that runs counter to this will of the people. This is being demonstrated more and more every day in a thousand different ways. The Soviet-American alliance has been confirmed in the hearts and minds of the American masses. On November 7 it will be the entire Nation which celebrates the twenty-fifth anniversary of the rise of the Soviet Union, including the official leadership of the United States as well as the masses of the people.

This does not mean that the United States has turned or is turning to socialism. Such an interpretation would be radically false. There is no intimation in the United States of a mass abandonment of its capitalist system of economy and society. There is the general belief that if the United States rises to its tasks in this war, and fulfills its responsibilities in the crushing of Hitlerism, that it will go into the postwar period as a capitalist nation.

But this also is no contradiction to a further fact, that the American people are beginning to understand that the Socialist society of the Soviet Union is the source of its unparalleled achievements in the war which restored for the United Nations the perspective of victory. Socialism, even though not generally accepted for the United States, is no longer looked upon as something alien and hostile to the American way of life, which was the view which had long prevailed over the minds of the great majority of Americans.

On the twenty-fifth birthday of the Soviet Union the American working class and people are more and more raising their voices to demand an immediate offensive on the western front against Hitlerism. Wendell Willkie expresses, on this issue, the sentiment of the American masses, who believe that President Roosevelt is fully committed to the same demand and are ready to strengthen his hand by all means, so that all restraining and hesitating influences can, finally be brushed aside.

Americans want to fight. They want to fight in full coordination with the Red Army, which they respect and love. They want to fight now. They will never forgive those groups and individuals responsible for holding them back so long from the fight. Such is in truth the spirit of the great majority of Americans as we come to the historic date of November 7.

For the American people the date November 7 takes its place alongside our own July 4, as part of the same forward movement of the human race. Just as Americans have always affirmed the universal significance of our revolution of 1776 and of George Washington, so now we have come to recognize the universal validity of November 7, the Soviet Revolution of 1917 and Joseph Stalin.

In the fires of the common war against Hitlerism, in the blood of the best sons of both countries given to a common cause, in the gathering of the peoples of the world into the United Nations, in the final winning of victory through joint struggle, this American-Soviet friendship and alliance will be so fully sealed that it

will be a great fortress for the collective security and progress of all peoples in the postwar world.

THE TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SOVIET POWER

(By V. J. Jerome)

Twenty-five years ago the Soviet State was founded. Today all progressive humanity marks the even in tribute.

Out of the experiences burnt into their consciousness in this global war for the destruction of fascism, the peoples have come increasingly to recognize the meaning of the Soviet Union's existence to their national freedom, to their democratic attainments. The barriers of confusion, prejudice and hostility, built up for years by Soviet haters, are breaking down under the spring torrents of liberated admiration and widening understanding for the Soviet people and its leaders. Day after day public utterances of leading Americans bespeak the deep-going solidarity of America's millions with our valiant and most powerful and most dependable ally:

"Street by street, house by house, life for life, Russia fights for her existence and for world security against aggression," declares former Ambassador to the Soviet Union Joseph E. Davies. "They are also fighting our fight when they are fighting Hitler. From Thermopylae to Verdun history records no spirit more indomitable, more heroic, than that of the Soviet Union, its leaders, its brave army, its unconquerable people."

"The Catholic Youth Organization is thrilled by the visit of Miss Lyndmila Pavlichenko to Chicago at the invitation of our outstanding mayor," says Bishop Bernard J. Sheil, director general of the Catholic Youth Organization. "She represents a great people who are writing history by their heroic defense against a ruthless invader. May God bless them."

"No man can leave Stalin's presence these days without admiration for his devotion to the cause of saving his people from the barbarous thrusts of Hitler's merciless hordes," says Wendell Willkie on his departure from Moscow.

They who in the past have blocked American-Soviet friendship do not conceal their alarm. Wendell Willkie's declarations extolling the Soviet Union and calling for a second front have aroused the fury and hatred of the defeatist press. The resentment is not limited to the defeatists. The New York Times seems to be disturbed by the fact that "almost every observer sent into Russia," the President's envoy included, "sends back messages which are almost an echo of the Russian call for help." And the Times offers its analysis:

"We do think they have come into the field of a vast emotion. Out of the depths of the Russian nature there has sprung something of awe-inspiring splendor. We think this is greater than communism. We have a right to hope that it may after this war liberalize and spiritualize communism's hard outlines."¹

The Times is correct in speaking of awe-inspiring splendor, of the vast emotion that impels the Soviet people to deeds of heroism which are the glory of humanity. But why, we have the right to ask, has the nature of this splendor, its very possibility, been withheld from our Nation for 25 years—yes, by the very journal that sports the motto "All the news that's fit to print"? And how shall those answer who have systematically sought to conceal the source of this heroic emotion in the Soviet man, woman, and child? How shall they answer who have sought to defame and belittle that source?

Out of the depths of the Russian nature? Shades of the Dostoevskian soul and fumes of the confessions gases! The years have not passed in such number that we cannot still hear that same camp of psychologists exclaiming that the economic and cultural backwardness of Russia under the tsars expressed the peculiarities of the "Russian soul": Not in the Russian nature rich in the centuries-old heritage of struggle against oppression, not in the nature that brought forth the vanguard Russian proletariat, but in the sloth of *Oblomovism*² they saw the "soul" of Russia; in the phosphorescence of decay they beheld that soul's splendor—it survived for them among the tsarist emigrés of Paris and Mukden. Since a certain day in late 1917, however, they have not otherwise found the "Russian nature" so palatable; now they revert to it in order to weaken the summons of America's good-will emissary to common fighting action.

¹ Editorial of September 29, 1942.

² The allusion is to the character Oblomov, who, in Goncharov's famous novel by that name, typifies the social inertia, stagnation, and indifferentism of nineteenth-century Russia.

There is a "Russian nature" out of which has sprung awe-inspiring splendor. That nature is no mystical abstraction. It inheres in concrete reality—the economic, political and social status of the Soviet people. It is the nature of a people that has transformed its nature. It is the nature of a people that has made the leap from Oblomovism to Stakhanovism. It is the nature of that people of whom Wendell Willkie said: "Here in Russia you realize the real meaning of the phrase 'This is a people's war.'" It is the nature that may attain like splendor in all peoples when their inherent greatness is released by great historic aims.

The nature of the Soviet Union, its essence and its meaning to the world, must be more fully understood, to make the U. S.-U. S. S. R. coalition stronger and more effective, to hasten the second front for a full victory of the coalition. The interests of the common struggle of the United Nations and the deepening of American-Soviet amity require the fullest clarity upon the bases of our Soviet ally's heroic stand. The people must be armed against the veiled and open attempts to undermine America's vital relationship with the Soviet Union. The very launching of the second front—supreme urgency of the hour—and the shipping of vital war necessities to our Soviet ally are impeded by the Munichite propaganda of confusion and slander that is a danger to America and to the United Nations. The morale of our armed forces and of our civilian population depends on the speed and effectiveness with which we crush the traitors in treason who, to distract attention from their organized plottings of a negotiated Hitler "peace," publish and broadcast such fabrications as that the "Russian enigma" makes us uncertain of the Soviet Union's course.

The cause of Allied unity demands the destruction of this tissue of falsehoods spun by the lose-the-war camp. The people must be grounded in the understanding that the Soviet Union is no "enigma," but that its course of action is straight, unfailing, and clear-ringing as the fire from Lyndmila Pavlichenko's gun. There is still lacking a wide-scale grasp of the causes that make the Soviet Union, its fighting forces, its people, and its leadership the object of world acclaim. It is clear to all that the Soviet Union is, and for 16 fateful months has been, the mainstay of the United Nations' fighting strength; that "the hopes of civilization," in the words of General MacArthur, "rest on the worthy banners of the courageous Russian Army." Not yet understood broadly is how this has been made possible.

The role of the Soviet Union in this war for national liberation is not an accidental, unexplainable phenomenon; it is the wartime expression of the fundamental role of the Socialist state in history.

The Soviet Union displays the fighting mettle that has earned for it world wonder because, founded on the principles of Socialist democracy, it is the most consistent and resolute fighter against fascism; because the scientific bases on which its social system was built from the first are diametrically opposite and irreconcilably hostile to everything that fascism represents.

When, in the Communist Manifesto, close to a century ago, Marx and Engels foresaw that its historic course would lead the working class to assume "the position of ruling class," they predicated working class rule upon the basic task: "to win the battle of democracy." And when the proletariat of Russia raised itself to the position of ruling class, Lenin declared: "The Soviets are the higher form of democracy; moreover, they are the beginning of the Socialist form of democracy."

The surge of the workers' state into existence brought to the laboring masses and all the oppressed everywhere the joyous realization that in a sixth of the world the age-old aspirations of the "wretched of the earth" were now to be fulfilled. The revolutionary struggles of the modern working class, repressed in blood in the Parisian June days of 1848, defeated on the barricades of the Commune "heaven stormers," crushed in the Russia of 1905, now had brought a proletariat to power. The freedom for which Spartacus led the embattled slave army in antiquity, for which Wat Tyler and Thomas Müntzer led the serfs in sweeping struggle; the freedom that the Magna Carta initiated, that the great French Revolution proclaimed in the rights of man, that the American Revolution inscribed in words of fire on its battle banners—was now to be advanced to the highest stage of realization.

It is a tribute to the magnitude of the social transformation effected by the October revolution that the voices—and not only the voices—of all who stood in the way of progress were raised against the Soviet power. All too well known are the vilifications and malicious distortions, running the gamut from "nationalization of women" to "totalitarianism." One charge rose from them all: Soviet power, the dictatorship of the working class, means the end of all democracy.

Thus, even today, in the year of the Soviet people's glorious democratic apogee, the year of Sevastopol and Stalingrad, an "authority" on world affairs can deliver himself of this cynicism:

"From 1921 onwards [Russia's] example was followed by country after country which combined rebellion against the Versailles settlement with rejection of democracy, sometimes paying lip-service to democracy, as the Russians had done, by purporting to set up a new and more perfect form of it."³

One might expect that the lessons of the years, if they could not enlighten, would at least shame the slanderers. But the cheeks of falsehood are fashioned of brass.

Russia's example was the example of supreme democracy. The workers' state could not, by its essential nature, adopt a course other than the realization of the fullest democracy. The working class in power, the working class allied with the masses of the peasantry, means the rule of the vast majority.

A workers' state requires an organized form that corresponds to its political essence and implements its historic tasks. That form—evolved from the experiences of the Paris Commune and the revolutions of 1905 and February 1917, proposed and elaborated by Lenin, and instituted under his leadership—was Soviet power.

Lenin taught that in the course of winning the battle of democracy the Soviets, as the new state apparatus, are, in the first place, defending the gains of the revolution, through having set up an armed force of workers and peasants—a force that "is not divorced from the people as was the old standing army, but is fused with the people in the closest possible fashion." Secondly, the Soviets are "a bond with the masses"—the deep and indissoluble connection of the workers' state with the laboring people of city and village. Thirdly, the superior democratic character of the Soviets is reflected in the fact that their members are elected and subject to unhampered review and recall in accord with the popular will. Fourthly, their strong ties with the most varied occupations facilitate the introduction of reforms, free from bureaucratic formalism. Fifthly, their organizational form makes it possible for the vanguard of the laboring people, the proletariat, to extend leadership and political training to the vast peasant masses that previously "stood remote from political life and from history." Finally, in that they act both as legislative and executive bodies, as well as through the general flexibility of their form, they combine "the advantages of parliamentarism with the advantages of immediate and direct democracy." Summed up, the function of the workers' state and its Soviet form has been, from the beginning, as set forth in Lenin's Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government, "to draw [the masses of the people] into independent political life, to educate them politically by their own experience," thereby "teaching the whole of the population the art of administration."⁴

The Soviet form of the workers' state—in realizing the objectives set forth by Lenin—has enabled the people to attain that unity of purpose and political initiative which alone explain their unshakable morale. It is the democratic basis of Soviet power which has made possible, the firm, granite-like national unity of the Soviet people and the indestructible ties with its Government and Red Army, such as have never been beheld.

The task of the workers' state to establish total democracy would have remained unachieved had the requisite economic foundation not been laid. Scientific communism is distinguish from utopianism in that it is enabled by the developing historical conditions, not only to project the consummate democracy, but to chart the course for realizing that democracy through the establishment of its material basis.

When, in 1926, toward the close of the period of economic restoration, effected by the new economic policy, the land of the Soviets, led by the Bolshevik Party, undertook its great task of socialist construction, its enemies laughed. Some of its "friends" were skeptical at the "experiment." Bourgeois economic and sociological experts derided the 5-year plan and proved statistically, psychologically, biologically, that it was doomed to failure because, the profit motive lacking, the workers had no incentive to fulfill the plan. Prophets of doom arose on all sides. The words of those oracles of ill omen have now found their place with the ashes of history. The anti-Leninists within the party presented as insuperable the economic and technical backwardness of the country and raised the cry that the alliance of the working class and the peasantry would be dis-

³ Coward, Hallett Carr, *Conditions of Peace*, Macmillan, New York, 1942, p. iv.

⁴ The distinguishing characteristics of the Soviets were classically presented by Lenin in his famous article "Can the Bolsheviks retain state power?" written on the eve of the impending proletarian revolution.

rupted; they clamorously denied the possibility of building socialism in the single Soviet state and set about organizing their ideological denial into practical betrayal. Defeated, repudiated, and eliminated are the Trotsky-Bukharin camp of wreckers and traitors. The victorious advance of socialist construction reared the Soviet Union into a fortress of strength for the defense of world democracy. Without the achievement of socialist industrialization and of collectivization in agriculture, climaxized by the great 5-year plans, Hitler would today be the conqueror of the Soviet Union. Without the victory of the Stalinist party line, Britain and America would today be doomed lands at the mercy of gauleiters.

In 1925, before the 5-year plans, Soviet industry was still much inferior in output and equipment to the industries of the leading capitalist countries; the economy of the U. S. S. R. was still a backward, predominantly agricultural economy. This meant that the workers' state was dependent on the hostile capitalist world for machinery, industrial materials, and many vital manufactured goods, including even the weapons of defense.

The socialist industrialization of the U. S. S. R., on which depended the success of socialism and the defense of the workers' state, thus became the foremost task facing the Soviet people. The first partial goal, which was set in 1929, was the adoption of the first 5-year plan (first projected by the party in 1927) which called for the modernization and expansion of industry, with special emphasis on two key industries: machine-building and heavy industry (mining, smelting, metal stock producing and heavy fabricating). In the 4 years and 3 months which sufficed to fulfill the plan, industrial output approximately doubled. The second 5-year plan, fulfilled in 1937, completed the reconstruction of the national economy on modern technical lines, doubled once again the volume of industrial production, and in particular achieved the mechanization of agriculture. It achieved its main historical task—the elimination of the remnants of the exploiting classes.

The great plans, besides raising the material and cultural standards of the Soviet people, insured the safety and future of the Soviet state. As events have emphatically demonstrated, the construction of the Soviet defenses was of crucial importance for all the anti-Fascist peoples. Throughout the period of socialist construction, the greatest emphasis was placed, not only on building for the Red Army and Navy a great fighting machine, but on developing all industry with a view to rapid conversion, transplantation, and regional self-sufficiency under the exigencies of national defense.

In the Constitution of the U. S. S. R., there is now inscribed the living reality that socialist economy is the basis upon which the Soviet Union is established:

THE TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF SOVIET POWER

"The socialist system of economy and socialist ownership of the means and instruments of production, firmly established as a result of the abolition of the capitalist system of economy, the abrogation of private ownership of the means and instruments of production and the abolition of the exploitation of man by man, constitute the economic foundation of the U. S. S. R."

Upon this socialist economic bedrock rises the structure of socialist democracy.

"The right to work," declares the section of fundamental rights and duties of citizens, "is insured by the socialist organization of the national economy, the steady growth of the productive forces of Soviet society, the elimination of the possibility of economic crises, and the abolition of unemployment."

The constitution accords all citizens "the right to rest and leisure."

"The right to rest and leisure is insured by the reduction of the working day to 7 hours for the overwhelming majority of the workers, the institution of annual vacations with full pay for workers and employees and the provision of a wide network of sanatoria, rest homes, and clubs for the accommodation of the working people."

The constitution accords all citizens "the right to maintenance in old age and also in case of sickness or loss of capacity to work."

"This right is insured by the extensive development of social insurance of workers and employees at state expense, free medical service for the working people and the provision of a wide network of health resorts for the use of the working people."

The constitution insures for all citizens "freedom of religious worship and freedom of antireligious propaganda."

The constitution guarantees by law to all citizens freedom of speech, press, assembly, and street demonstrations.

"These civil rights are insured by placing at the disposal of the working people and their organizations printing presses, stocks of paper, public buildings, the streets, communications facilities, and other material requisites for the exercise of these rights."

The "right to unite in public organizations—trade-unions, cooperative associations," and other organizations is insured to all citizens:

"In conformity with the interests of the working people, and in order to develop the organizational initiative and political activity of the masses of the people."

In regard to the rights of woman—"the chained Andromeda of modern society," De Leon called her—the constitution states:

"Women in the U. S. S. R. are accorded equal rights with men in all spheres of economic, state, cultural, social and political life.

"The possibility of exercising these rights is insured to women by granting them an equal right with men to work, payment for work, rest and leisure, social insurance and education, and by state protection of the interests of mother and child, prematurity and maternity leave with full pay, and the provision of a wide network of maternity homes, nurseries, and kindergartens."

In the basic respect of rendering the constitutional rights of the Soviet citizens, in the economic, political, and social spheres, insured rights—not merely rights formally recorded, but rights whose exercise is made actually possible and is legally guaranteed—socialist democracy transcends every form of democracy society has known.

The socialist democracy flourishes upon the soil of the great community of interests that unites the Soviet people in an indestructible unity.

The new working class of the U. S. S. R. (no longer, as Stalin pointed out, a proletariat, a term connoting a class bereft of the means of production and hence exploited), is now, in conjunction with the entire people, the master of the country's resources and productive implements, for whom labor has been elevated to "a matter of honor, a matter of glory, a matter of valor and heroism." This new working class, with ranks unified, asserting its initiative and leadership through its free and democratic trade-unions and other organizations, its politically most conscious members united with other advanced sections of the working people in the vanguard Bolshevik Party, and knowing itself to be part of the world working class, is achieving miracles on the production front and is manning the guns on the Soviet sector of the United Nations' battle front.

And it is this working class—to the shame of American labor, it must be said—which has been found wanting by the majority of the American Federation of Labor leadership. It is this vanguard section of the world trade-union movement whom the Hutesonion trade-union tyrants label "totalitarian."

Well did Jack Tanner, fraternal delegate from the British Trade Union Congress to the recent A. F. of L. convention, answer all such blockers of cooperation among the trade-unions of the United Nations:

"We are proud to be associated with that brave people through our trade-union organization, and if we are told that the character and spirit of their trade-unions is different from that of the British trade-unions. I can only reply that the character and spirit of the Soviet trade-unionist in the fight against Hitlerism are also somewhat different from what our own has been to date. * * *

"To say that the trade-unions of the U. S. S. R. are nothing but appendages to the state machinery is to leave out of account the nature of the state and whose interests its activities foster and serve. In our two countries, we cannot pretend that it is the workers' interest which will triumph in any issue, unless we put up a strong and organized fight. But there is no evidence to support the idea that in the Soviet Union such a fight is necessary if the matter is one which concerns the well-being of the workers, and if it is not necessary, the organizations which, in other countries and conditions, would conduct such fights, naturally assume a different character and take on different activities."⁵

The victory of socialism emancipated the village with the town. The backward, scattered peasant husbandry which was the norm of the economy—until 1930 predominantly agrarian—became transformed into large-scale, collective, socialist agriculture. With this deep-going revolution in the national economy, "equivalent in its consequence to the revolution of October 1917," the Soviet peasantry became transformed into a peasantry of a new type. The victory of the collective-farm movement, aided materially, culturally and morally by the working class and the Soviet Government has freed the peasant masses from

⁵ The Worker, October 11, 1942.

exploitation and from oppression by landlords and usurers. The Constitution of the U. S. S. R. declares all collective farm enterprises, with their livestock and implements, as well as their products and buildings, to be the socialist property of the collective farms; it declares the land occupied by the collective farms to be secured to them free in perpetuity. The Soviet peasants have not only achieved a life of well-being; their life has become permeated with modern culture. From the ranks of the new peasantry have come forward leading, educated citizens in the various professions. And from the Soviet fields and villages have come millions of patriots, imbued with love for their fatherland, sworn to annihilate the fascist invader. The socialist patriotism of the peasantry finds its nobles symbol in the man, who, born the son of Bessarabian peasants, and at one time a farmhand, is now—Marshal Timishenko.

Of that patriotism, Ralph Parker, Moscow correspondent of *The New York Times*, wrote early this year:

"The peasants destroyed things because they were confident that the state would restore their means of livelihood. Socialism stands or falls by its capacity to provide work, and the Russian worker or peasant has come to expect that the state will take care of him. Indeed, there is a strong case to be made for the theory that only in socialist states is a scorched-earth policy possible on a complete scale. Certainly the collectivization of land facilitates the tragic and heroic acts of self-sacrifice that Premier Joseph Stalin ordered to weaken the foe."⁶

The rise of the socialist democracy necessarily involved, side by side with the basic transformation in the national economy, a revolution in the sphere of culture. "The October Revolution," declared Stalin, "is not only a revolution in the domain of economic and social-political relations; it is at the same time a revolution in the minds, a revolution in the ideology, of the working class." The new society required the new man—and begot him.

Socialist construction provided the material basis and released the social forces for the cultural revolution. Socialist democracy means today, as current Soviet life magnificently demonstrates, the people's democratic initiative and participation in the development of their cultural resources and activities for strengthening the struggle for national liberation.

The Soviet Constitution accords all citizens the right to education.

"This right is ensured by universal compulsory elementary education; by education, including higher education, being free of charge; by the system of state stipends for the overwhelming majority of students in the universities and colleges; by instruction in schools being conducted in the native language, and by the organization in the factories, state farms, machine and tractor stations and collective farms of free vocational, technical, and agronomic training for the working people."

That this provision in the constitution has been made a reality is demonstrated by the unprecedented advance of culture in the Soviet Union. By the end of the second 5-year plan, illiteracy, which characterized 70 percent of the population in 1913, had decreased to less than 5 percent; the number of primary and secondary school pupils had increased from 8,000,000 to nearly 30,000,000; the number of college and university students had grown to 550,000—greater by almost 25 percent than the combined total attendance in the corresponding institutions of England, France, Germany, Italy, and Japan; and the number of readers had increased to such an extent that the books in the Soviet libraries amounted to 75 for every 100 inhabitants. The Red Army, a vast school and cultural force in itself, had over 30,000,000 books in its libraries. The scientific, planned socialist economy, inaugurated through the zealous participation of the people, has built up a mass scientific attitude and has vastly stimulated and released the nation's cultural forces. From the 3,000 professional scientists that prerevolutionary Russia counted, the number had risen at the time of the launching of the third 5-year plan to 40,000.

Out of the ranks of the liberated workers and peasants has come a new intelligentsia, working integrally with the people, drawing its incentive and inspiration from the people and serving the people's cause. And of the old intelligentsia the best elements either identified themselves from the first with the October revolution or, through their growing realization of what socialism spells for culture and for themselves as cultural workers, have come over to the side of the socialist people.

The culture of the socialist society is no facade of enlightenment to conceal a house of darkness. It is an edifice shining from foundation to spire with the

⁶ The New York Times, February 2, 1942.

truth of free man's achievements. It is no hierarchy of the elite, the experts, over a people bidden to remain in passivity. It is a life activity of a unified people fashioning its destiny consciously.

The democratic roots of the socialist culture and the vital meaning of culture for the socialist people are attested by the tremendous role of the sciences and the arts in the great struggle of the Soviet Union for national liberation. Soviet cultural activities are not promoted as "a sleep and a forgetting." Nor are they an artificial stimulus to the popular morale. The culture of socialist democracy speaks out of the people; it is their deep will to victory creating—creating not only to celebrate the Red Army's and the nation's heroic deeds, but also to utter criticism where criticism is due, to correct, to suggest, to urge, to achieve.

Striking is the instance of a recent play by Alexander Korneichuk, *The Front*, published in *Pravda* and scheduled for immediate Nation-wide production. The *Front*, in presenting the heroic exploits of the Red Army and its leadership, lays bare, with ruthless criticism, shortcomings in certain commanders—military conservatism coupled with self-complacency—which have hindered the rout of the invaders and have been responsible for some of the defeats suffered by the Red Army.

"The play," a review in *Pravda* states, "sets every worker thinking, makes him take a critical view of his shortcomings, and fires him with the striving steadily to improve his work. * * * The publication of Korneichuk's *The Front* is a sign of the great strength and vitality of the Red Army and of the Soviet state, for only an army which confidently faces the future, which is confident in victory, can disclose its own shortcomings so frankly and sharply in order to eliminate them."⁷

In the Soviet Union the search for truth is a moral and political obligation. Self-criticism is the oxygen of socialist democracy. The people's culture is ever self-examining, self-renewing, self-expanding.

The Soviet Union has solved the national question. This sentence epitomizes for the peoples of the world an achievement unequalled in the whole history of the struggle of nations for independent life and self-development. Proceeding from the simple truth enunciated by Marx that no nation oppressing another can be free, Lenin and Stalin formulated the scientific program which led to the opening of the Czar's Bastille of nations and brought the freed peoples comprising a hundred and fifty nationalities into a voluntary fraternal union of equal republics, a socialist commonwealth.

In regard to the rights of the nations and peoples embraced in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the constitution provides:

"Equality of rights of citizens of the U. S. S. R., irrespective of their nationality or race, in all spheres of economic, state, cultural, social, and political life, is an indefeasible law.

"Any direct or indirect restriction of the rights of, or, conversely, any establishment of direct or indirect privileges for, citizens on account of their race or nationality, as well as any advocacy of racial or national exclusiveness or hatred and contempt, is punishable by law."

In that multinational union the anti-Fascist United Nations can behold the fullest fraternal cooperation among the varied great and small nationalities. They can see, in place of the policies of spoliation, obscurantism,⁸ pogroms, and ferocious "Russification" carried on by Czarist imperialism among the oppressed non-Russian nationalities, the economic, political, and cultural regeneration of the nationalities which was effected by the Soviet Government. They can see the wholesome unity of nations risen in defense of the common fatherland, where no second-rank citizenship degrades any single people and weakens the fighting capacity of the entire land; where no discrimination is directed at a people of a darker skin, sapping the vitality of the all-national war effort; where no anti-Semitism brings the poison of Hitlerism into the camp warring upon Hitler; where no colonies exist to become a stamping ground for Axis "liberation" demagoguery. They can see the living reality of the declaration by Stalin:

"* * * The draft of the new Constitution of the U. S. S. R. is * * * profoundly internationalistic. It proceeds from the proposition that all nations and races have equal rights. It proceeds from the fact that neither difference in color

⁷ *The Worker*, October 11, 1942.

⁸ Revealing is this passage from a confidential report submitted to Nicholas I by the chief of the Fifth Gendarmerie Corps "on the condition of the aliens inhabiting the Kazan Gubernia": "Experience of all times proves that it is easier to rule an ignorant people than a people that has received even the slightest degree of education. * * * In accordance with this precept the authorities over the Chuvash people are exerting every effort to keep them in ignorance."

nor language, cultural level, or level of political development, nor any other difference between nations and races, can serve as grounds for justifying national inequality of rights. It proceeds from the proposition that all nations and races, irrespective of their past and present position, irrespective of their strength or weakness, should enjoy equal rights in all spheres of the economic, social, political, and cultural life of society."

The profoundly democratic character of the Soviet Union marks also its foreign policy. The protection of the vital national interests of the U. S. S. R. has always coincided with the needs for national security on the part of all peoples. By its nonimperialist essence, the workers' state at all time safeguarded its people and territory without plundering foreign lands or interfering in their domestic affairs. Notable in this connection is the Declaration of Rights of the Peoples of Russia, by which the week-old Soviet Government, on November 16, 1917, accorded the nationalities the right to self-determination and separation. (When, a month and a half later, the Finnish Parliament declared Finland's independence, the Soviet Government, within 2 days (January 2, 1918) extended its recognition.) Notable too is the Soviet Union's renunciation of tsarist Russia's traditional annexationist policies with regard to the Dardanelles and with regard to Port Arthur and Dairen. And in full keeping with its continuous policy of friendship for the Chinese people, the Soviet Union early renounced the tsarist policy with regard to China. Thus, in 1919, when the Red Army pursued the Kolchakist White Guards in the direction of the Far East, the Soviet Government issued a declaration to China by which it rejected all claims to the Boxer indemnity and other special privileges. In 1922, the Soviet Union renounced all treaties of the tsarist government with China, declaring itself "willing to return to China without compensation all Chinese territory seized by the tsar." This declaration was embodied in the Soviet-Chinese treaty of May 31, 1924, by which China was for the first time accorded the status of a first-rank power. The principle actuating these steps has marked every alliance or pact into which the Soviet Government has entered.

"We stand for the support of nations which are the victims of aggression and are fighting for the independence of their country." These words of Stalin, spoken in March 1939, at the Eighteenth Party Congress, have been abundantly corroborated by Soviet policy throughout the years. The assistance that the Soviet Union has continuously rendered, and is still rendering, to the Chinese Nation in its war of salvation, is a factor that will contribute vastly to bring victory to that heroic people. Writing in *Liberty* for December 21, 1940, Madame Chiang Kai-shek stated:

"Intellectual honesty constrains me to point out that throughout the first 3 years of resistance Soviet Russia extended to China, for the actual purchase of war materials and other necessities, credits several times larger in amount than the credits given by either Great Britain or America."

Memorable are the unflagging efforts of the Soviet Union and its representative, Litvinov, at the League of Nations in behalf of invaded Ethiopia to bring about a complete blockade of Fascist Italy.

When the democratic capitalist governments, abetted by Social-Democratic leaders, engaged in that accommodation to the Fascist invasion of Spain hypocritically styled "nonintervention," the Soviet Union declared through its representative on the Nonintervention Committee, on October 7, 1936:

"The Soviet Government cannot consent to the conversion of the noninterference pact into a screen for concealing military assistance to the rebels against the legal government by some participants in the agreement."

And the Soviet Government acted upon that declaration. It sent guns and planes to the Spanish democrats, who faced Hitler's and Mussolini's mechanized forces almost unarmed. Soviet technicians and instructors went to their aid. Soviet ships brought food to the blockaded Spanish people. Spain and the world will forever remember the staunch struggle of the Soviet Union on the side of the Spanish people.

Dr. Edward Benes, the former Czechoslovakian President, on arriving in the United States, revealed in an authorized interview with Erika Mann, published in the Chicago Daily News, on April 18, 1939, that the Soviet Union had stood ready to carry out its pledge of military assistance to Czechoslovakia even if France and Britain failed her. "Russia was faithful to the very last moment," the account of the interview quoted Dr. Benes as saying.

These actions of support to weaker nations attacked by fascism were an integral part of the Soviet Union's magnificent fight for collective security.

Today, as the United Nations look back amid the flames of war to those crucial years, can they fail to see that had the upraised fist of the People's Front, not the

bribing palm of appeasement, been put forward; had the counsels of Moscow, not of Munich, been heeded; had the aggressor been quarantined—the hordes of Hitler would not now be riding roughshod over the bodies of nations?

The anti-Hitler alliance today of the Soviet Union, Britain, and the United States at the head of the United Nations is history's verdict of the correctness of the collective-security policy which the Soviet Union urged the nations to adopt against Fascist aggression.

Likewise, history has already confirmed the wisdom of the U. S. S. R. in signing the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact. Let those who still persist in representing that pact as a "skeleton in the closet" be reminded of the facts:

Up to the last the Soviet Government endeavored to maintain the peace front of the democratic nations. The policies of the Munichite camp had sabotaged and utterly dismembered that front, and it became manifest that peace could no longer be preserved on the basis of collective security. The maneuvers of the reactionaries who were at the helm of the British, French, and Polish Governments were cynically directed at coming to terms on another Munich basis with Hitler at the expense of the Soviet Union, at isolating the Soviet Union and plunging her into a war of attrition with Hitler Germany. The last stage in the tragic rejection of collective security was the Anglo-French-Soviet military discussions of the summer of 1939, in which every effort of the Soviet Union to implement the peace front and to obtain workable joint guarantees of Poland against Nazi aggression was blocked. The Soviet Union adopted an independent policy and took the step which frustrated the designs of the imperialist intrigues.

As events have well shown, that nonaggression pact, far from being, as the enemies of the Soviet Union rushed to proclaim, a move of "capitulation" to Hitler, was based, as Stalin pointed out in his radio address of July 3, 1941, "on one indispensable condition, namely, that this peace treaty does not infringe either directly or indirectly on the territorial integrity, independence, and honor of the peace-loving states." Far from being "inimical" to the interests of the anti-Hitler forces, it was, on the part of the Soviet Government, that master stroke which enabled the Soviet Union to strengthen its strategic position and to prepare its fighting power for the day of Hitler's onslaught, to prepare that power for the war, not only of its own national liberation, but of England, America, and all the United Nations.

During that entire period and up to the time when it was treacherously attacked, the Soviet Union pursued a policy designed to prevent the spread of the war and to strengthen the democratic forces in struggle against fascism. It supported the national liberation struggle of the Yugoslav people and endeavored to bring about an all-Balkan anti-Hitler coalition. It continued its aid to China. It liberated Byelorussia, western Ukraine, Bessarabia and northern Bukovina from the toils of reaction and the imminent threat of Nazi enslavement. It supported Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia in their struggle for national and social liberation; established mutual assistance pacts with these Baltic states marked out as points of attack against the Soviet Union; and on the basis of their plebiscitary request admitted the three new Soviet republics into the great family of free nations, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. It frustrated and defeated the Nazi-Finnish intrigues and provocative attacks which were abetted by the Chamberlain-Bonnet imperialist forces. The blow struck then against the Finnish Fascists—the smashing of the redoubtable Mannerheim line, the protection of the Soviet border, and the safeguarding of Leningrad—was a blow struck in behalf of the United Nations of today.

During that entire period the Soviet Union maintained vigilance on its own frontiers, strengthening its Red Army and its defenses against all contingencies, and standing as a great barrier to Hitler's drive for engulfing the Balkans and the strategic Middle East, which would have meant disaster for Great Britain and the United Nations of today. By thus immobilizing a considerable part of the Nazi army, the Soviet Union contributed to holding back Hitler's invasion of England and his preparations for the attack upon the Americas. Hitler himself admitted in his proclamation of June 22, 1941, that it was the Soviet Union which had prevented him from conquering Britain:

"While our soldiers from May 10, 1940, onward had been breaking the power of France and Britain in the west, the Russian military deployment on our eastern frontier was being continued to a more and more menacing extent. From August 1940 onwards I therefore considered it to be in the interests of the Reich no longer to permit our eastern provinces to remain unprotected in the face of this tremendous concentration of Bolshevik divisions. Thus came about

the result intended by the British and Russian cooperation—namely, the tying up of such powerful German forces in the east that the radical conclusion of the war in the west, particularly as regards aircraft, could no longer be vouched for by the German High Command."

What a travesty on history is therefore the statement in a column of the New York Times (September 20, 1942) : "Britain saved herself in 1940 without Russian aid, without important American aid. Britain saved herself when she stood alone." And what more fitting comment is needed on the contribution of every such statement to the cause of the United Nations than the fact that that very column is now being circulated in thousands of broadsides by the Fascist Christian Front?

On June 22, 1941, the Soviet Union took up arms against the Nazi invader.

On July 3 Stalin spoke to the world:

"Our war for the freedom of our country will merge with the struggle of the peoples of Europe and America for their independence, for democratic liberties.

"It will be a united front of peoples standing for freedom and against enslavement and threats of enslavement by Hitler's Fascist armies."

A united front of peoples!

The war of the peoples against Hitlerism has proclaimed collective security as its rallying slogan! The struggles of the nations for survival have merged—into one war indivisible, one camp indivisible.

The Atlantic, which once was vaunted by isolators as our ocean barricade, has become the symbol of a Charter of the embattled United Nations—a Charter which must be made to extend to the Pacific. The policies of the Munichmen to isolate and attack the Soviet Union have been transformed into the historic pacts and agreements of Britain and the United States with the Soviet Union. In place of the unnatural division between the two great democracies—the United States and the U. S. S. R.—which the helpmates of Hitler long sought to foster, have arisen the natural friendship and the fighting alliance of both nations.

This natural friendship has its basis in the immediate and lasting community of interests of the two great democratic peoples—a truth expressed continuously for years by Earl Browder.

Today it is broadly and increasingly recognized that the deepest principles of freedom and democracy actuate the men, women, and children of the Soviet Union in their struggle to destroy the Fascist invader. A few miserable and distorted creatures, like Lady Astor and that aspirant to the role of an American Doriot, Norman Thomas, venomously attempt to deny this. Such denial does not get far with the soldiers and sailors in the American armed forces, who take their hats off to the Soviet Union. The makers of guns and tanks and planes, the workers in civilian defense, the wives and sweethearts of our soldiers and sailors—the people on our home front; these spoke through Wendell Willkie their confidence in the Soviet Union and its leader, Joseph Stalin, in the land where the people run the people's war; where the fifth column has been extirpated in good season; where the Red Army, the people's army, fights with a morale based on the knowledge that for democracy to live, fascism must be ruthlessly annihilated.

The example of the Soviet Union shows us that democracy gives the people the will to destroy those who would destroy it.

Military campaigns, hailed by MacArthur as "the greatest military achievement in all history"—heroism unparalleled on the part, not only of a magnificently trained and politically enlightened army but of an entire people—these can be explained only by the fact that these people fight for the country which they collectively and democratically rule—"street by street, and house by house." Only democracy—democracy of a kind never known before in history—democracy rooted in the bedrock of common ownership of the country's resources and means of production—democracy spread over a broad framework of popular participation in all phases of government—democracy back by the strength of free, equal, and united nations—such democracy has been able to give to the Soviet people the stamina and the stature they show in this greatest war of all times. After 25 years of Soviet power, the Russian people demonstrate with blow after blow, with retreat only to attack again, that they cannot be beaten; such a people will not go under; they are knit together in the vast indestructible morale of their Socialist democracy.

But day by day the price our Soviet ally is forced to pay through the non-realization of full coalition strategy is rising. Our ally's costs are our costs. His peril is our peril.

Stalingrad, hard-pressed defender of the cities of democracy, calls to London, New York, Washington, San Francisco. Its call stings us to remember the words of General MacArthur:

"The history of failure in war can almost be summed up in two words: Too late. Too late in uniting all possible forces for resistance; Too late in standing with one's friends."⁸

Shall we be too late in standing with our friends?

The course for America is clear.

"We now hold the keys to an adequate policy for winning the war. These keys are: The American-Soviet-British facts and alliance—the bulwark of the United Nations and of world democracy; the Washington and London agreements to open the second front in Europe and to extend all-out aid to China. With the fulfillment of these historic agreements, we will have a guiding policy for victory."

So spoke Earl Browder, general secretary of the Communist Party and chief protagonist for the fullest development of American-Soviet friendship.

On this twenty-fifth anniversary of the Soviet Union's founding, the American working class and people are eager to join the Soviet people in fighting comradeship on the western front for the decisive blow against fascism and the complete triumph of the coalition of the democratic nations.

OUR NATION DISCOVERS THE SOVIET UNION

(By Hans Berger)

The discovery of America at the end of the fifteenth century altered the entire aspect of the world. Had we as a nation discovered the Soviet Union, as we are beginning to do today, a quarter of a century, or at least 5 years, or even 3 years ago, we should probably have a different world than the one we now behold. Today, one no longer need be a Communist or a "suspicious character" in order to appreciate this fact. Dorothy Thompson, in a speech delivered at Tanglewood, Lenox, Mass., on August 25, 1942, thus put into words what millions today are thinking:

"The greatest disservice was done to the democracies by those who believed in the Fascist accounts of Russia. It was said that Russia had no armaments, no air force, that the Russian people were on the verge of revolt, that it would morally collapse in the first weeks of war.

"The greatest tragedy of this war, and one for which we have paid with unlimited suffering, and will continue to pay with more suffering, was the breaking of the French-Russian alliance at Munich. It made this war certain and inevitable. In September 1938, an aggressive Germany—had the European treaties not been abrogated at Munich—would have had what she could not face: a two-front war. From that day until now, it has been impossible to have a two-front war on Germany."

But with respect to the Soviet Union, we as a nation, and especially those who were looked upon as our most authoritative spokesmen, were assuredly no Columbus. Toward the U. S. S. R. we failed to display that undaunted, forward-surg ing pioneer spirit with which our forefathers were so richly endowed. There was no good reason why we should not have recognized, years before we did, the historical role of the Soviet Union, as Vice President Wallace, for example, recognized it in his famous speech of June 1, 1942, a speech that has been passed over in dead silence by the greater part of the press:

"The march of freedom of the past 150 years has been a long-drawn-out people's revolution. In this great revolution of the people, there were the American Revolution of 1775, the French Revolution of 1792, the Latin-American revolutions of the Bolivarian era, the German Revolution of 1848, and the Russian Revolution of 1918. Each spoke for the common man in terms of blood on the battlefield. Some went to excess. But the significant thing is that the people groped their way to the light. More of them learned to think and work together."

Yet it was not until the year 1933 that we finally made up our minds to establish diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union, and the President who was responsible for this was looked upon as taking a very bold step, indeed. Hoover and his kind to this day cannot forgive him for it.

We Communists have never hesitated about confessing our mistakes and shortcomings, when the occasion called for it. Is it not about time that all those

⁸ The Officers' Guide, 9th edition, July 1942 : The Military Service Publishing Co., Harrisburg, Pa.

who did so much to create a misunderstanding of the Soviet Union were giving a little self-analysis to the matter? What a sorry role was played by so many of our scholars and scientists, by so large a part of our press, our literature, our radio, our motion pictures, our political parties, by so many trade-union leaders, churches, schools, and universities with respect to the U. S. S. R. during all these 25 years.

The Assistant Secretary of War for Air, Robert A. Lovett, at a meeting of the Bankers' Club—at which, incidentally, he met with warm applause—thus formulated in sarcastic terms the ignorance which our country has displayed in the past with reference to the Soviet Union:

"Two American officers in their official report said that 'from observation of the work of the Russian mechanics one could conclude that in certain respects they surpassed American crews in their mechanical intuition. Their ability to repair any and all difficulties was phenomenal.'

"No doubt the information that those officers had on Russia came from those outrageous old geographies we studied in the sixth grade, you remember, under the heading of 'Characteristics of the inhabitants.' About the middle of the page opposite the map the comments on Russia were about as follows: 'The Russians are a people largely given to agricultural pursuits. In winter the country is covered with snow and a type of sled, called the troika, is a common mode of travel.' Equipped with such pearls of knowledge, it is little wonder we were ripe for surprise."

It was not, however, merely a matter of ignorance with us; it was what we in this country thought we knew about the Soviet Union: it was our prejudices, our lack of understanding, our Philistinism that made the relations of our country with our Russian Soviet ally of today so full of tragic and fatal mistakes, thereby contributing to the world situation with which we now find ourselves confronted. If, after this war is over, an academy should be founded with the object of investigating the causes of the war, these learned academicians will surely find themselves in possession of a flood of literature of all sorts, a flood of propaganda of every conceivable form against the Soviet Union, of a kind that has been produced in our country for the past 25 years. This academy would indeed be in a position to compile an encyclopedia of lies, slanders, and falsifications, and for material they need only turn to Hearst's lynch-law press, to the distinguished literary section of the New York Times, or they may avail themselves of certain allegedly profound scientific treatises, hypocritical sermons, open incitations to pogroms, statements by attorneys general, warnings issued by trade-union leaders against the establishment of relations with the Soviets, lurid romances à la Jan Valtin, etc., etc. Can one, for example, realize that even today there are people who would try to make out that the Soviet Government is settling Jews in Biro-Bidjan in order that they may serve as cannon fodder in case of a Japanese attack?

There was, of course, not the slightest reason for our being surprised at the Soviet Union, when in hundreds of books, newspaper articles, speeches—not by Communists, but by men and women of the most diverse shades of opinion—the development of the U. S. S. R. was to be found depicted in all its enormous diversity. The possibility of learning the truth about the Soviets, betimes, was all the time at hand, but the great majority of our people were not in a position to grasp it. For in this democracy of ours, in which, unfortunately, big business and its ideologists so largely control public opinion, by means of the press, the movies, the radio, and the like, about 9 out of 10 persons, more or less, were likely in mental darkness regarding our Soviet ally. That a country in which there is no private property in the means of production should have made such giant forward strides and should display so high a degree of technical, moral, and cultural development, was something which our people must not come to know. That the Soviet Union was a land constituting the bulwark of civilization and progress must similarly be kept from them. What obstacles we Communists encountered when, in the interest of our own country and the war for human freedom, we attempted to spread the truth about the land of socialism: how strenuously we had to combat the campaign of lies, slander, and calumnies. We were in a position similar to that of the great abolitionist, William Lloyd Garrison, with regard to slavery. When a friend said to him, "You are too excited, you are on fire," Garrison replied, "I have need to be on fire, for I have icebergs around me to melt."

The fire of war is beginning to melt our own national iceberg at an unprecedented rate of speed. In the fire of war, in the face of the heroic role that the Soviet Union is playing in the fight for freedom, our prejudices against the land

of socialism are being consumed as by flame. It is an incontrovertible fact that the majority of our people are deeply democratic, deeply antifascist, and that they want to see the war against Hitler carried forward to a victorious conclusion; whence the admiration which they feel for their Soviet Russian ally, their desire to understand the Soviet Union better. Even the Chicago Tribune, the Daily News, the Hearst press and the like are compelled, much against their will, to contribute to the strengthening of this admiration for our Russian friends and to publish facts that lead to a better understanding. For they must daily bring news of the Russian Reds' heroic stand. Even they cannot withhold from their readers the epic battle of Stalingrad. They cannot keep the people from knowing that the socialistic Soviet Union is the one power in the world up to now which has been able to halt the Nazi armies.

The poor white in the South, chock full of prejudices that have been crammed into him by the descendants of the slaveholders, the poor farmer in the Middle West, the previously backward worker in a small inland town, even Mr. Babbitt himself—they have all been hearing now for 17 months of the heroic resistance of the people concerning whom, for the past 25 years, they had been accustomed to hear only the worst. All these misinformed millions are now engaged in drawing the correct conclusions for themselves, and in doing so display a hundred times more wisdom than do the gang of "scholarly" hacks who for so long now have been sniping away at the Soviet Union. What are these conclusions? The Soviet Russians know what they are fighting for. These are not those downtrodden Slavs, "languishing under Stalin's tyranny," these Red soldiers who would rather die than surrender, these embattled workers and peasants, women and children. And so they go on to reason in their own simple fashion: a country which can withstand so terrible an onslaught must have an outstanding military and industrial organization; it must have outstanding experts and leaders, with the confidence of the people behind them. A country whose population is made up of so many different nationalities, and which yet, amid the flames of a terrible war, in spite of retreats and setbacks, has so few traitors in its midst—such a country must have found the key to the brotherhood of nations. The great writer, Pearl Buck, has put these conclusions of our people into the following beautiful words:

"The Russian people in this war for freedom are setting an example for all of us because they are fighting as a united people without prejudice of race. As an American, this means more for me than anything else."

What a longing breathes from these words: a longing that we, the American people, might be able to heal our own form of the disease of racial prejudice, in the manner of our Soviet ally.

Even the malicious attempt to bring up the question of religion against the Soviet Union, and to make this serve as a barrier to American-Soviet friendship, has come to naught. It is by no accident that we hear the prominent Catholic, Alfred E. Smith, making the statement: "The Russian Army and people are serving magnificently as the spearhead of our fight."

It is no exaggeration to assert that the attitude of our Nation toward the Soviet Union has changed, fundamentally. The knowledge of the Soviet Union that is possessed by a relatively small minority will more and more redound to the benefit of the vast majority of our people, and an alliance with the Soviets will no longer appear as something "criminal," but as a progressive step. The U. S. S. R. no longer appears as a mysterious Colossus, endeavoring day and night to overthrow our democratic institutions. Today it is seen to be the best ally that we could have in this our war for national survival. Archibald MacLeish has put it this way:

"It is time, finally, to say to those who would divide the Americans from the Russians and the Russians from the Americans because they differ in their institutions and in the concepts of their lives, that it is precisely because of this difference—precisely because of this open and public and admitted difference—that the union of the Russian and American peoples is a powerful weapon in this war and a triumphant symbol of the meaning of this struggle."

The great majority of our people are beginning to realize that the Soviet Union is not fighting for "Red imperialist aims," as Hoover would have us believe; that it is not even fighting for its own freedom alone, but for the freedom of all mankind. Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, was speaking in the name of the American people, when he declared:

"The heroic resistance of the Russian people to the international bandits has aroused the admiration of the world. Our Russian allies are fighting successfully not only for themselves but also for the rest of mankind. We must spare

no effort to give them every aid and encouragement in their epic struggle against savagery."

And even though William Green, head of the American Federation of Labor, does not as yet clearly see the role of the Russian workers and the Russian trade unions, he nonetheless understands very well the meaning of American-Soviet friendship:

"This is a people's war. The people of America and the Russian people are in the same boat. They will share their resources generously, just as they will share the glory of victory triumphantly."

It was the very heart of our Nation speaking, when Senator Claude Pepper's words rang out:

"When free men hereafter, in a free world, linger upon the record of this convulsive era, no name will be more luminous than that of Russia. * * * As one looks back over the wreckage of the last decade, one can now appreciate, however, what a Herculean effort Russia made to arouse the rest of the world against Hitler's accelerated machine."

Our own people are beginning to realize, in spite of all the attempts that are still being made to have it appear that the Soviet Union is a "totalitarian dictatorship," that the people of the Soviet Union have forged for themselves a life that is worth fighting and dying for, and that it is this way of life which enables them to fight the way they do against so formidable an adversary. How many lies and humbug tales have been strung together to make it appear that Stalin is a "bloodthirsty villain"; yet today there are comparatively few Americans who do not have the deepest respect for Stalin's greatness, farsightedness, and iron will.

Millions also are discovering today that the Soviet Union does not "destroy the family" as they had been told, but that it rather defends the family and confers upon it social security. They are discovering that in all the realms of art and culture the Soviet Union has tremendous achievements to show, and that, in the domain of technological development, in spite of the fact that it has had only a quarter of a century's experience, it is not far behind ourselves. Millions of our people are beginning to realize that these Reds have developed prodigious skills, as was shown by more than one young fighter at Stalingrad. At the same time, they could not help noting that, even as the battle for Stalingrad was in progress, an effort was afoot in our own Congress to raise the cost of living for the American people. These are the kind of things that, as this war goes on, are not likely to be forgotten.

It goes without saying that even today it is not made easy for some of our people to understand the "miracle" of the Soviet Union, as the Dean of Canterbury, in his book, has described it in so wonderfully clear and simple a fashion. How ridiculous it would seem to us, if Soviet journalists were to undertake to deny that we in this country have the highest degree of technological development and the most powerful industry in the world—all because the capitalist system still happens to exist with us. On the contrary, it is a well-known fact that the Soviet Union admires our technological achievements and has learned much from them, despite the fact that we live under a system of monopoly capitalism. Still today we find not a few people—and not all of them in the ranks of the appeasers, by any means—who, having been forced to forget their old stupidities regarding the U. S. S. R., would now endeavor to trig them out in new garments. These gentlemen are to be heard discussing in all seriousness the question as to whether the Russian people fight so valiantly because they have a socialist system, or in spite of the fact that they have such a system. The reason for such discussions is clear: These gentlemen fear that our own people may come to have dangerous thoughts, to the effect that it takes a Socialist order of society to produce such a nation of heroes, along with the efficiency necessary to withstand so formidable an enemy. These gentlemen still shudder at the thought that the Bolshevik Soviet Union is our friend, and that it today stands in the forefront of the battle of humanity. One need not be a Communist in order to clear up such speculations as these concerning the miracle of the Soviet Union, with its Russian, Ukrainian, Jewish, Turkmenian, Bashkir, Kalmyk, and all its other nationalities. Mr. Ralph Barton Perry has given a complete and quite remarkable answer to this kind of thinking, in a letter to the New York Times of July 8, 1942:

"But the heart of the matter is our attitude toward communism itself. It is commonly said that Russia has renounced communism and reverted to nationalism. That the present struggle has drawn upon the older and deeper reserves of Russian patriotism and blurred the lines between Red and White is no

doubt true. But it would be foolish and dangerous to count upon the adoption of a capitalistic democracy in Russia. It appears probable that the present unity of Russia is largely the product of her communistic faith; that a military victory will confirm that faith in the sentiment and conviction of the Russian people. If we are to avoid wishful thinking and avert a revival of old antipathies we must come to an understanding not with a Russia fashioned on our own model but with a communistic Russia. That is the other pier on which we must hope to build a bridge of agreement."

The attempt to deny the socialist character of the Soviet Union, the attempt to explain its heroism, in spite of its socialist character, the attempt to predict a capitalistic future for it, means to resume once more the old war against the Soviet Union. In the flames of war, the iceberg of our prejudices is rapidly melting. This is an undeniable fact. On the other hand, nothing could be more dangerous than to assume that the reactionaries, the appeasers, the narrow-minded ones, and those who never learn anything, will not make use of every means and take advantage of every opportunity to halt and nullify this course of development, to sow the seeds of new hatreds and dissensions—in short, to breathe new life into the old abandoned prejudices. This is particularly evident right now in connection with the question of opening a second front.

It is evident, also, in the case of those who are ready to praise to death the Soviet Union. Beneath this is concealed their desire to fight the present war to the last Russian, along with a plethora of compliments and laudatory speeches. Such praise would have represented a brave gesture some years ago, but it counts for little at a time when Stalingrad is there to speak for itself. As soon as they find they can get no further along this line, the faces of these gentlemen are no longer wreathed in smiles of praise, and instead we hear from them a glacial laughter and cynical remarks.

The Hearst press, the Chicago Tribune, the Daily News, and similar organs engage in the crudest efforts to make the people believe that the Soviet Union is trying to force the Allies into a "suicidal action," by demanding the opening of a second front.

The tempo and degree of stability of our friendship with the Soviet Union is bound to prove decisive for the outcome of this war for our own national existence; it is bound to be a decisive factor in the shaping and development of the after-war world. That is why the fact that a veritable revolution in the thinking of our people on the subject of the Soviet Union is already being consummated, is of such tremendous importance. It is one of the arms of victory. But when we view the war as a whole, then we must at the same time realize that our Nation has not yet drawn the full and fitting conclusions from it all. For in this common war for survival, the indestructibility of our friendship with the USSR and victory itself will be assured only through common action—through common military action—through the fullest mutual collaboration on the part of the Soviet Union and ourselves.

To speak the essential truth, we have not yet completely left the domain of words—fair and honorable words, it is true, words of admiration, words that mark a thoroughgoing transformation in our way of thinking—to pass over onto the plane of action. Our Nation has not yet attained those heights from which it may sweep away all Chamberlainism, all opposition, all obstacles, all wavering, to throw itself, along with Britain and the Soviet Union, into a decisive struggle for the annihilation of mankind's archenemy. Our Nation must draw the practical conclusions from its own words. On the decisive question of the second front, there are still huge icebergs to be melted. The patriots of our land have enormous tasks ahead of them, and especially the working class, the class whose patriotism is historic, in this great struggle for human freedom in which we are engaged.

EXHIBIT C

THE GLORIOUS VICTORIES OF THE RED ARMY

(By Dmitri Manuilsky)

The Soviet country, the Soviet people, and its Red Army are passing through stirring days. The significance of these historical days can be expressed in one word—"victory." It is not yet final victory. Much effort will still be needed by the Army and people to rout and destroy the enemy.

This victory is being born in great battles. The smashing of the enemy fortified belt, which the Germans considered impregnable, by the Red Army; the liquidation

of strong points which they regarded as insuperable; the fording of rivers which they looked upon as impassable—all this is building up the victory.

It is emerging from the close pursuit of the enemy troops who are fleeing from the danger of encirclement looming over them, from the hundreds of thousands of German corpses, from the enormous cemeteries of German tanks, planes and guns. This victory is being forged by millions of people, by the whole Soviet people.

German Fascist propaganda is now trying to have the world believe that the German Army is allegedly "withdrawing according to plan" for the purpose of "shortening the front." Only a perfect idiot could believe that the surrender of the Orel base by the Germans, that base from which they intended to advance on Moscow; that the retreat of the Germans from their fortified line at Taganrog; that the opening of the "Smolensk gateway" by them is in any way in keeping with the plans of the German command.

Even to a baby it is obvious that once the front is shortened for the German Army it is in like manner shortened for the Red Army too. However, it suffices to look at the map to see that the Germans have failed to effect any shortening of the front. Just the contrary. The winding line of the Dnieper where the Germans would have liked to retain a foothold, is if anything, lengthening the front.

However, the very fact that such fraudulent talk about "withdrawing according to plan" is indulged in speaks of the existence of panic in German Fascist circles. On July 5 of this year the German command launched an offensive in the Orel and Belgorod directions which according to its words was to decide the outcome of the war.

Concentrating 17 tank, 3 motorized, and 18 infantry divisions on 2 small sectors, the German command hoped by concentric blows from north and south to pierce the Soviet defense and encircle and destroy the Soviet troops situated on the arc of the Kursk salient. The Kursk arc was defended among other Red Army units by those which had played a decisive role in the encirclement of the German Sixth Army at Stalingrad.

All the German war prisoners stated in one voice that intensive propaganda had been carried out among the Hitler troops on the need to place the Russian armies of the former Don front in "Kessel" in revenge for the defeat suffered by the Germans at Stalingrad.

The mass annihilation of German manpower and equipment, unprecedented in any of the most violent battles of the present war, started in the very first days and hours of the German offensive. The greatest battle in history, as the German Fascist command called its Orel and Belgorod operation, buried forever the illusions harbored by the Germans that after their winter defeats they would succeed in mending matters in the summer of 1943.

The German plan for a summer offensive utterly collapsed. On August 5, exactly 1 month after the German offensive was launched, the Red Army captured Orel and Belgorod, thus laying the basis for beginning the successful offensive operations which are still continuing.

After losing Orel the German Fascist command firmly held on to its highly important center of resistance at Kharkov. On August 23 the troops of the steppe front, actively supported on their flanks by the troops of the Voronezh and southwestern fronts, in violent battles crushed the enemy resistance and captured Kharkov by storm.

The salvos of the Kremlin guns heralding the glad tidings of the capture of Kharkov were heard in Kiev and Odessa, in Minsk and Vilno, in Tallinn and Kovno, in Riga and Kishinev. They were heard by the men of the southern front who were preparing an assault on the German fortifications on the Min River, at the Taganrog fortifications, which the German command considered a miracle of engineering technique and far superior to the famous Maginot or Siegfried Line.

On August 30 the supreme high command of the Red Army announced the glorious victory of the troops on the southern front who had smashed the German Min front. Kharkov and Taganrog to a considerable extent determined the fate of the Donbas, which was liberated from German Fascist occupation by September 8. Just a few days before this the front in the Smolensk direction was pierced and Yelnya was occupied by the Soviet troops.

While the Red Army was clearing the Donbas the troops of the central front began their heroic march into northern Ukraine, looming over the flanks of the German Fascist troops who were trying to entrench in the central and southern

parts of the Ukraine. On September 6 the troops of the central front occupied Kounotop; and on September 9 Bakhmach, an important railway junction, center of enemy communications and decisive strong point of the German defense in the Kiev direction.

On September 15 followed the liberation of Nezhin. Every day brought new and outstanding Red Army victories. On September 16 the troops of the north Caucasic front in interaction with the ships and units of the Black Sea fleet, following 5 days of violent battles, gained possession of Novorossisk. That same day the Soviet troops fording the River Desna captured Novgorod-Seversky, and on September 17, Bryansk.

On September 19, Red Army units smashed the German fortified belt covering the so-called Smolensk gateway. Then followed Chernigov and Poltava. On September 25 the troops of the western front crossed the Dnieper and captured, by assault, Smolensk, which the Germans regarded as the key to their defense on the Soviet-German front. The Red Army emerged on the bank of the Dnieper. As a result, the Red Army smashed the enemy front in a number of important directions and forded the rivers Mius, Seim, Desna, Vorskla, Sozh, and others.

In a little under 2 months the Red Army advanced from its initial position 314 kilometers and more, liberating from the German invaders territory of more than 300,000 square kilometers.

The Red Army returned to the Black Sea fleet the naval port of Novorossisk, second in importance to Sevastopol, thus creating the conditions for successful naval operations in the Black Sea.

Economically the Red Army victories are of exceptional importance. The Red Army has given back to the country the Donbas, the most important coal and industrial district of the country; it wrested from the claws of the German plunderers the most fertile section of the Ukraine, rich in grain and technical crops. The Red Army liberated from the German Fascist yoke tens of millions of Soviet people, tens of thousands of inhabited points, and hundreds of Russian and Ukrainian towns and regional centers. The Red Army entered the territory of Byelorussia. In its sweeping offensive operations the Red Army saved hundreds of thousands of Soviet people whom the German Fascist fiends were preparing to drive into slavery in Germany.

In the absence of a second front in the west, the Red Army, by its successful operations, rendered inestimable service to the Soviet Union's allies, hastening Italy's withdrawing from the war and facilitating the landing of Allied troops on Italian territory.

Finally, the Red Army victories are of immeasurable significance from the viewpoint of their moral and political effect on the enemy's army. In the enemy camp the successes of the Soviet troops are giving rise to feelings of despair and hopelessness and are affecting for the worse the already declining fighting capacity of the German Fascist soldiers.

* * * * *

What are the reasons for the brilliant victories of the Red Army? They are, above all, the brilliant strategy of the Red Army supreme high command; the foresight of its military plans to rout the enemy; the ability, not only to see through the enemy's designs but to upset them in good time; the ability to take advantage of the enemy's vulnerable spots, systematically to wear down the enemy and inflict a crushing blow on him at the most appropriate time, at the most suitable place, and thus impose our will on the foe.

The reasons for the successes of the Red Army are to be found in the splendid qualities of the Red Army men: in their fearlessness, endurance power, and fervent patriotism; in the qualities with which they have become imbued through the centuries of Russian history. The summer fighting against the Germans revealed the Red Army's ability to maneuver boldly and frustrate the stereotyped tactics of the Germans.

In the summer battles the Soviet troops displayed truly Suvorov swiftness, accomplishing long marches and suddenly appearing where the enemy least expected them. They revealed unexampled courage and great skill in fording river barriers. At Novorossisk they showed their ability to combine blows from the ground with naval landing operations, which decided the fate of the Germans, not only in Novorossisk but also the fate of their bridgehead fortification in the Kuban.

The summer battles showed the world at large that the Red Army has highly talented generals who are fully capable of carrying out the brilliant plans of the Red Army Supreme High Command and of ruthlessly routing the vaunted

German generals who in their self-confidence considered themselves experts in military matters. Finally, the summer battles showed that Soviet industry supplied the Red Army with up-to-date weapons in such quantities as to insure the success of the offensive and to cut down to a minimum Soviet losses.

However, although the Red Army's successes are great it should not for a minute be forgotten that the Soviet people are face to face with a foul and cunning enemy. The peoples of the Soviet Union and the Red Army are fully justified in holding the entire German Fascist army responsible for all their despicable and foul crimes. The justifiable cry "Death to the German occupationists" is not only a call to retribution dictated by the feelings of justice inherent in every Soviet citizen. It is a wise measure of state and national defense against the imperialist adventurers, a measure which means the removal of the bandits and robbers who have violated the standards of the human community.

From this rise the tasks confronting all Red Army men and commanders—tirelessly to drive the enemy off Soviet soil, allowing him no chance to recover, to rest, or to entrench on river positions or other natural barriers.

The Red Army troops must forestall the enemy, must break into the inhabited points and towns occupied by him before he has a chance to carry out his foul destructive work.

Let the glorious victories of the Red Army still further extend the partisan struggle which is inflicting blows on the enemy from the rear. Let the example of the heroic Minsk partisans, who removed the executioner of the Byelorussian people—Wilhelm Kube—serve as an example to all the districts of the Soviet country still occupied by the enemy.

EXHIBIT E

CONCERNING A CHARGE OF BETRAYAL.

(By Hans Berger)

Mr. Max Lerner, in an article entitled "The Unpopular Front," in PM of March 28, criticized the Communist policies as Earl Browder developed them at the January meeting of the national committee of the Communist Party. Since that criticism brought into focus all liberal criticism of an apparently "left" character currently directed at the Communists, it merits discussion. Lerner's main argument against the policy presented by Browder are the following:

"There are two premises in the new Communist Party line, as expounded authoritatively by Earl Browder in his interview given to PM's Harold Lavine, upon which everything turns. One is that the world's fate hinges on Russia's future and Russia's alone. The second is that American progressives must give up their home-front struggle to fulfill the promise of American life, lest Wall Street fall out of the Tehran alliance. I consider the first a misconception, the second a *betrayal*." [My emphasis—H. B.]

The misconception lies in Lerner's interpretation of Browder's position. Browder took as the starting point in his basic report, as well as in his interview, not the Soviet Union, but Tehran—that is, the agreement entered into by the leaders of our own country, Britain, and the Soviet Union for strengthening the leading coalition in the United Nations, for hastening victory through establishing the timing and the scope of the western front, and for laying the basis for postwar reconstruction through the continued Anglo-Soviet-American collaboration "in the war and in the peace that will follow." Browder's starting point was not the question: What kind of policy must we pursue in order to help the Soviet Union? His starting point was the question: How best can the national interests of the United States—the winning of the war, the maintenance of future peace, and the furtherance of economic and social well-being—be promoted?

If Lerner would attempt a serious analysis instead of indulging in general phrases, he could not deny that this is the central problem on which the future of our Nation and of the world depends. Browder explained in great detail that the significance of Tehran lies not only in the fact that it paves the way for effective military cooperation (the second front) but in that it offers also the perspective of postwar collaboration between the democratic capitalist powers and the Soviet Union. The peaceful coexistence and cooperation of the United States, the Soviet Union, and Britain following the defeat of Hitler Germany and her satellites is the prerequisite for obviating another World War. If, after

the common victory over Hitler, certain imperialistic circles were to succeed in their aim of unleashing unbridled interimperialist rivalry, or of setting the course of the United States or England toward war against the Soviet Union, the world would head for a still more terrible war catastrophe, in the course of which ultra-reaction would proceed to black out the democratic life of our Nation. Such a war would be prepared, as was the case in Germany, by systematic reaction, by a systematic campaign for stupefying and brutalizing the masses, by systematic suppression of the working-class movement and of all liberal opinion. The American fascistic reactionaries, just as Hitler did, would support the most anti-democratic adventurer elements in other countries, would intervene directly and indirectly to crush all working-class and generally progressive forces in other countries in order to obtain allies, gendarmes, and quislings. American reaction, American Fascists would attempt to achieve with far more open means what English policy achieved between 1917 and 1939, not without help on our part, and what was so "brilliantly successful" in Germany.

This is the basis on which Browder focuses the attention of America on "Tehran," as the core of every present and future policy affecting our Nation and the world. Browder does this as a Marxist, warning with Marxist farsightedness against the horrible possibility of a new World War, with the most terrible consequences for the life of the entire Nation and especially for the conditions of the American working class and all liberals, including the Max Lerners. Browder, the Marxist, has never declared that Tehran automatically guarantees against the possibility of such a development. Just because "Tehran" must be fought for, and maintained and developed in struggle against its opponents, just because reactionary pro-Fascist forces are attempting and will increasingly attempt to destroy the basis it has given us, Browder warned so explicitly against the anti-Tehran perspectives and urged upon the Nation full understanding and wholehearted implementation of the wartime and peacetime policies of collaboration agreed upon at Tehran.

* * * * *

Where is the misconception of which Lerner speaks? Without question, the Tehran agreement is also in the interest of the Soviet Union. It is of utmost importance to the Soviet Union, and equally so to the United States and Britain, to end this war as swiftly as possible in coalition warfare through the second front. It is of the utmost importance to the Soviet Union, and equally so to the American and British Nations, not to be drawn into a new World War and to prevent such a war.

Nor is Tehran less in the interest of France and of the other peoples of Europe, whose liberation depends on the cooperation of the great powers, and whose postwar development would be in the greatest danger if American and English reactionaries attempted to make them gendarmes against the Soviet Union and other peoples.

Browder's premise, therefore, does not, as Lerner falsely interprets, make "Russia's future and Russia's alone" the pivot of all policy. That premise is the premise recognized by the President of the United States in conjunction with the leaders of Great Britain and the Soviet Union, who voiced the deep-going sentiment of the American, British, and Soviet peoples, as the only basis for policy for the three great coalition powers on the road to victory and an enduring peace. When the German Communists declared that friendly relations to the Soviet Union were a life-and-death matter for the German Nation, they were charged by the German Max Lerners with considering the Soviet Union "primarily" and "in opposition to" the interests of the German Nation.

Lerner declares he is for Tehran. But when Browder presents the full meaning of Tehran as the basis of every serious progressive policy, then Lerner talks about "misconception." It behooves one in Lerner's position to accustom himself to thinking questions through to the end. Were he to discard the arrogance of superficiality, it might be possible for him to learn from the Communists to be a consistent progressive.

* * * * *

Lerner accuses Browder and the American Communists of "betrayal." He asserts that the Communists demand that the "American progressives give up their home-front struggle to fulfill the promise of American life, lest Wall Street fall out of the Tehran alliance." Lerner writes:

"What is Browder's basic fallacy is the belief that the American isolationists and the reactionary primitives can be appeased rather than they must be mastered; it is his belief that they can be lured into good behavior on foreign policy

if *only we surrender to them on domestic policy.* This is to substitute the policies of blandishment and manipulation for the policies of a majority strength. *To abandon the home-front struggle thus is a betrayal of the best American progressive tradition. It is a betrayal of the Marxian tradition as well in its crucial principle—that men can, acting together, transform themselves by transforming their living conditions and their power structure.* I know of very few thinking American progressives who will not be surprised at the extent to which the Communists now depart from their basic principle." [My emphasis—H. B.]

Lerner has often expressed his spiritual concern about our existence, and has let it be known that in his opinion it would be best if we disappeared. Lerner belongs to that group of liberals who have a troubled conscience concerning the Communists. They fear to be branded as fellow-travelers, since that would create difficulties for their whole material and social existence. They must therefore continuously still their conscience and better judgment with new arguments against the Communists. They must continuously prove to the world and to themselves why they are not consistent.

Wherein does this "betrayal" consist? Lerner does not make clear when this betrayal occurred. Does the betrayal consist perhaps in the fact that we support the Roosevelt administration? That we are opposed to strikes in the war? That we oppose the raising of divisive issues that would weaken our Nation's fighting power and civilian morale? Does the betrayal perhaps consist in the fact that we are inflexibly determined to carry this policy through to victory? What other policy have Lerner and PM to propose?

Where do Browder and the American Communists "appease" the American "isolationists" and the "reactionary primitives"? Don't the Communists carry on a consistent struggle against the defeatists and pro-Fascists who would hinder the prosecution of the war, who put all possible obstacles in the path of the administration, who systematically attempt to disunite and demoralize the Nation? Don't the Communists carry on a constant struggle against the reactionary, pro-Fascist forces who want to undermine our relations with our Allies and smash the strength of the United Nations? We ask Lerner and PM: "In what does the betrayal consist?"

What other policy is a progressive one? If John L. Lewis, perhaps, Lerner's ideal? Is Lerner's ideal the Trotskyite camp, which defames this great war of national liberation as "imperialist"? Is Lerner's progressive ideal Norman Thomas, that Socialist helpmate of Hitlerism who finds a dozen "progressive questions" a day, all of which have but one aim, to prove that the consistent prosecution of the war is not in the interest of the American Nation?

Browder condemned the First World War as an imperialist war. He went to jail for his just belief. Browder and the American Communists, in common with all enlightened American patriots, know this war to be a war for national liberation. They, therefore, draw all the conclusions that will help prosecute this war vigorously. The American Communists would be traitors to the interests of the American working class and of the Nation if they did not make speedy and decisive victory in the war the guide to all their policies, to which all other questions must be subordinated.

Hence, the Lerners must be asked publicly: Wherein lies the betrayal by the American Communists in this war of liberation? And what, gentlemen, is your policy?

Does Lerner accuse us of betrayal because we do not consider socialism the issue on the order of the day? We do not know to what degree Lerner and PM and the liberals of whom he speaks consider the Socialist revolution to be an issue on the order of the day. That is not stated very clearly either in the articles of Lerner, or in PM. And if they really do consider it an actual issue for our day, they have been singularly skillful in concealing from the Nation the task which they propose it undertake.

Or is the charge of betrayal perhaps made on the assumption that we do not regard the working class any longer as the most progressive class in society, the class which, by its development, strength, and political maturation, qualifies itself for functioning as a leading force in the Nation? But there are no Communists, there have been none, and there will be none who ever doubted this basic thesis of Marxism. On the contrary, our liberals, including Lerner, don't understand to this very day this unalterable principle of Marxism—despite their extensive libraries.

Or is the accusation of betrayal leveled on the assumption that we have given up the fight for the development of our democracy, for full equality for the Negro

people, for wiping out the poll-tax shame, for safeguarding the democratic liberties so dearly won by the American people? Can the Lerners cite one instance from our practice or one sentence from our declarations that could substantiate such a charge?

Or is the accusation of betrayal made on the assumption that we have proposed that the workers, the toiling farmers, the great masses of the Nation say "amen" to whatever the reactionary forces in the Nation decree in the way of taxes, wages, prices, etc.? Lerner cannot deny that we carry on an energetic struggle against all depredations on the living standards of the men and women on the production front and support all campaigns that undertake such action. In conducting this policy of struggle, we make clear that under war conditions we are opposed to all such actions that would disturb war production and interfere with the prosecution of the war. That is why we have vigorously opposed Lewis and all advocates of strikes during the war.

The President in his annual message to Congress, in January, proposed an economic bill of rights, much clearer and more meaningful for victory and a progressive postwar development than anything proposed to date by liberals of the Max Lerner type. It is a program of far-reaching reforms which can be carried out in the framework of American capitalism. We welcomed this program, as did millions of trade unionists and millions of Americans of the most varied strata and occupations. As Communists together with all labor and progressives, together with the American fathers, husbands, sons, and brothers in uniform, we support such a program which declares:

"In our day these economic truths have become accepted as self-evident. We have accepted, so to speak, a second bill of rights under which a new basis of security and prosperity can be established for all, regardless of station, race, or creed.

"Among these are:

"The right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries or shops or farms, or mines of the Nation;

"The right to earn enough to provide adequate food and clothing and recreation;

"The right of every farmer to raise and sell his products at a return which will give him and his family a decent living;

"The right of every businessman, large and small, to trade in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and domination by monopolies at home or abroad;

"The right of every family to a decent home;

"The right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health;

"The right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident, and unemployment;

"The right to a good education;

"All of these rights spell security. And after this war is won we must be prepared to move forward, in the implementation of these rights, to new goals of human happiness and well-being."

If, instead of resorting to general phrases, Lerner would present a bill of particulars, he would discover that he has not the slightest grounds for accusing us of betrayal. If he endeavored to formulate concretely the needs of the American people, now and in the postwar world, he would find himself on the same platform with the great trade unions of our country, and also, whether it be to his liking or not, with us Communists. Only so long as he stays in the hazy "higher regions" can he hurl lightning bolts at us—bolts that are cold, devoid of the fire of truth.

Lerner reproaches Browder for "his acceptance of monopoly control of the American economy on the ground of inevitability and handing the world over to the despoilment by the cartels."

What does Browder accept and what does he see as inevitable?

Browder realizes that in its dominant sections American monopoly capital supports the war. The American capitalists have helped, by and large, to produce everything necessary for the war. In this historic hour for the American Nation, the decisive sections of American capitalism are aligned with all the patriotic forces of all classes in the great national war of our country. This very significant fact, in contradistinction to the situation in those European countries where the decisive strata of the bourgeoisie have brought national catastrophe upon their peoples, taken together with the nonsocialist ideology of the overwhelming mass of the American people, must be taken into consideration by every Marxist

who wants to pursue a practical progressive policy. What, therefore, is the issue, the inevitable issue, as it presents itself to every serious Marxist?

Should one ascend to the "higher regions" a la Lerner, in splendid isolation from the actual present situation, howl meaningless phrases about the power of the monopolies? Or should one set himself to work with labor, with the people, toward the effective solution of the most urgent wartime and postwar problems of the Nation? These are not little problems unworthy of a liberal custodian of Marxism. They are the problems of winning the war and of preventing a terrible postwar crisis with possibly 10,000,000 or 15,000,000 unemployed, and the most dangerous social and political consequences, nationally and internationally. What have the Max-Lerners to offer toward the solution of these problems?

Browder well put it:

"* * * Today, to speak seriously of drastic curbs on monopoly capital, leading toward the breaking of its power, and imposed upon monopoly capital against its will, is merely another form of proposing the immediate transition to socialism—or else it is the utopian trust-busting program of return to an earlier, pre-monopoly stage of capitalism.

"National unity around a program to break the power of monopoly capital is possible only if and when the majority of the people can be united for the institution of socialism in the United States.

"That time is not now, and certainly not in the 1944 elections."¹

For the Max Lerners, who refuse to face this reality (not created by the Communists), the only perspective is darkness, hopelessness, and desperate charges of "betrayal."

Earl Browder and the Communists do not see any reason for desperation. The American Communists consider it possible, even within the framework of American capitalism, to avoid the Lernerian darkness.² The precondition for objective postwar reconstruction is an appreciation of the extent of the problems to be solved after victory and the cooperation of all strata of the population who are determined in their mutual interest to avoid a colossal crisis.

Max Lerner appears outraged when Browder speaks of cooperation also with the patriotic sections of monopoly capital; Max Lerner does not understand what cooperation means. Consequently, he accuses the Communists of appeasing reaction. One can cooperate in various ways. Chamberlain cooperated with Hitler. The result was war and Fascist triumphs. The German Social-Democrats cooperated with Bruening in the great economic crisis. This cooperation consisted in permitting the Bruening government to throw the full burden of the crisis onto the backs of the toilers. As a result, the Fascist offensive was the more successful. In these cases the word "cooperation" was a synonym for capitulation, sacrifice of the interests of the working class and of the nation to reaction and fascism, with the well-known consequences. But Browder has not proposed cooperation in order that the burden of a terrible crisis might be placed on the people. On the contrary, he proposed cooperation through anti-Fascist national unity, precisely for guaranteeing the adoption of such measures that will avoid the crisis.

Browder states to the class in control of American economy: The great masses of the American people are convinced that our rich and resourceful country can, by internal measures and through economic cooperation with other countries for achieving the Tehran objectives, avoid a postwar crisis and mass unemployment. To solve the postwar problems will not be a simple task. But they can be solved. If you wish to avoid crisis and disintegrating social conflicts, it is necessary that in conjunction with labor, farmers, and middle classes, you work for the adoption of such common policies, supplemented by governmental measures, that will solve the problems of the postwar world.

It is a proposal to cooperate against unemployment, against crisis, against the danger of fascism and new imperialist adventures. It is the proposal to solve all the difficult social and economic problems of the postwar world in a way which will guarantee the maximum of peaceful development. It is cooperation in the interests of an economic bill of rights, not cooperation a la Chamberlain, or a social-democracy.

But Max Lerner has still another argument against cooperation. The Communists are so weak that the "tough capitalists" will not cooperate with them at all. Of course, the American Communists are still too weak today to con-

¹ Earl Browder, *Tehran and America*, Workers Library Publishers, p. 23.

² We would earnestly recommend to Mr. Lerner that he study the highly enlightening article by Gilbert Green in the Communist for April.

vinee tough American capitalists of the need for cooperation. Therefore, if this cooperation depended on the Communists alone it would be condemned to failure. Cooperation among various classes, in their mutual interests, can only be successful, and not be transformed into labor's capitulation, when the working-class movement, on the basis of maximum unity and an understanding of the whole situation, uses its strength to cooperate and to solve these urgent problems with the organizations and representatives of the other classes. Therefore, at the very time that they establish the necessity for this cooperation, the Communists, as part of the labor movement, emphasize the necessity for labor unity, the strengthening of trade-union organization and joint action.

Where in all these considerations, in these conclusions is there betrayal? Who can seriously assert that the development of such a policy as Browder has outlined makes it easier for reaction, for fascism, in America or in other countries? On the contrary, it is precisely such a policy—the policy based on Tehran—which shows the working class, the broad masses of the people, the whole Nation, the great historic course of achieving a speedy victory and of returning to peace without a postwar crisis, without threat to national security, and of creating the preconditions for further social progress.

×

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 05442 1902

